

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THE REV. R. R. WILLIAMS, M.A., Principal of St. John's College, Durham, was nominated by the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement as Burroughs Lecturer at the University of Leeds. The lectures were delivered in 1948 and have now been published under the title, *Authority in the Apostolic Age*.¹ The seven chapters composing the main part of the book are primarily historical and expository, and consider the exercise of authority, in the sense of 'moral weightiness,' in the primitive Church.

Beginning with a study of 1 Corinthians as an example of apostolic authority in action, the book goes on to consider the authority of history, of the ministry, of dynamic happenings (especially the miracles and the Resurrection), of common practice, and of Christ in His Church (in which the various strands of thought already considered are drawn together). The whole constitutes an illuminating study of the New Testament documents from a particular angle and in view of recent trends of criticism.

The author does well to follow up the main part of his book with two essays on the modern problem of authority, and it is to those essays we would here direct our readers' special attention. The first is an account of the modern discussion of authority in religion and in the Church. It endorses the late Dr. P. T. Forsyth's remark, 'As soon as the problem of authority raises its head, all others fall to the rear.' The writers under review are James Martineau (whose book on this subject, his *magnum opus*, appeared in 1890), Auguste Sabatier (1900), John Oman (1902), T. B. Strong (1903), and P. T. Forsyth himself (1912, whose book is described as one of the greatest on the subject of authority in the English, if not in any language).

It is here affirmed that Forsyth anticipates in 'The Principle of Authority' (which is not among the books of this author recently republished), the existentialist approach to Christian

¹ S.C.M.; 8s. 6d. net.

theology, the distinction between history and super-history, the interpretation of the Gospels by the Epistles, and the distinction between revealed truth and truths of revelation, revelation being essentially the revelation of a Person to persons.

After a brief concluding reference to some more recent contributions to the subject, Principal WILLIAMS proceeds in the second essay to treat of the contemporary problem of authority. Here is a summary of his thoughts on this subject. While they are in general sympathy with those of Liberal Evangelicals of the Church of England, they show 'a balance of emphasis'—as he himself phrases it—not always associated with Liberalism or with Evangelicalism.

First, there is no possible alternative in Christian preaching and teaching to a belief in God's authoritative act in Christ. Thereby, as P. T. Forsyth said, we have a 'final faith,' if not a 'final theology.' In so far as the Liberal Evangelical Movement has shared in the Hegelian rejection of 'particularity,' it has drifted from an essential anchor of New Testament Christianity.

On certain points, however, the extreme 'absolute' position, as represented to-day so forcibly by Karl Barth, requires modification. (1) A true doctrine of the Logos should maintain that throughout the created world there is an expression—limited as it may be—of the same mind which was in Christ Jesus. (2) A true doctrine of redemption does not lay so much stress on the personal experience of conversion and justification by faith as does the Protestant tradition. (3) A true approach on the part of the Christian evangelist should be based on a deep personal understanding of the point of view of those to whom he would proclaim the authoritative message.

Secondly, the three principal channels by which the authority of God's redemptive act in Christ is mediated are the Scriptures, the Church, and—

a special form of the latter—the Ministry; and the question arises as to the relation of the aforesaid authority to those various channels.

There are three ways in which the Scriptures should be recognized as a bearer of Christ's authority: as the classical, normative account of Christian origins, as a salutary check upon the Church's waywardness and heretical vagaries, and as the medium through which (as Augustine, Luther, and Barth testify) God speaks to men in every age.

As for the Church as a claimant to the title of bearer of Christ's authority, the claim is in this case by its very nature made within the Church itself. The Church, in the phrase of the Thirty-nine Articles, is 'a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ.' But the authority of the Creeds and Confessions in which the Church bears its witness is, properly regarded, essentially moral rather than legal or absolute. The balance between a proper rigidity and a proper flexibility is, however, not easy to define. Had not Randall Davidson taken a flexible view of the Church's legitimate authority in matters of belief William Temple would have been lost to the Ministry of the Church of England.

As for the authority of the Ministry, Liberal Anglicans should be alive to the danger of undermining the influence of episcopacy by claiming too much for it, and especially by relying too much upon doubtful exegesis. 'The Apostolic Ministry,' edited by the present Bishop of Oxford, does no more than present, at best, a plausible hypothesis. 'It is often rightly said that a Presbyterian minister is much more like a primitive bishop than is a modern bishop.'

For the rest, 'it is the Holy Spirit who brings home to Church and to Christian the authority of God in Christ. The Lord is the Spirit. His voice does not come to us always in unmistakable tones. We walk by faith, and not by sight. If in doubt, the individual will pay great attention to the voice of the Church. The Church will always try to move in loyalty to the Scriptures. And both Church and individual will be ready to leave room for the contemporary, living voice of God the Holy Spirit.'

Whether by accident or design the 'Second Thoughts Library' issued by the Paternoster Press resembles in format a well-known anti-religious library. Its new volume—*The Universe: Plan or Accident?*, by Dr. Robert E. D. CLARK,

M.A. (6s. net)—is an able and interesting and up-to-date statement of the argument that the intricate structure of the universe reveals design and thus compels belief in a Creator. Such a survey must increase in all believers, as the poetic survey in Job does, the sense of the majesty of God. This author holds, however cautiously, to the opinion that it also furnishes a logical basis for belief.

It is helpful to note, as he does not explicitly do, the distinction between pattern and design. The universe is obviously full of pattern not only of shape and colour but of function and behaviour. The question is whether this pattern amounts to design and therefore points to a designer. The argument must be not from, but to design.

A turn of a common kaleidoscope yields a pattern by the combined reflections of the chance arrangement of the bits of glass inside. It would be possible, however, by some device to cause the bits to tend to fall into special groups or positions so that, for example, however it was shaken, the reds and blues would keep apart. And it would be possible to get from the examination of one such pattern the conviction that it had not the familiar look of ordinary chance patterns but was due to the fact that this particular kaleidoscope had some special gadget in it designed to produce this peculiar arrangement. Knowing the common sort of pattern, we could see the difference. But in the case of the universe we are not familiar with the usual aspect of pure-chance universes from which we can notice that ours differs. This basis for the argument for design is absent.

It may also be pointed out what an enormous amount of most elaborately patterned activity goes on, for example in breathing or digestion, quite apart from any conscious will, and as efficiently in an imbecile as in a genius. So there are difficulties in taking pattern as a proof of conscious design.

Yet the patterns of the universe are so like to patterns produced by the human mind that they may be held to point to a similar origin. To Jeans' famous idea that physical science suggests the Creator to be a super-mathematician Dr. CLARK adds another from the study of evolution and biochemistry in regard to origins. An eye, for instance, that could see, might at once give its owner an advantage for survival and by natural selection be preserved and improved in a species. But it is difficult to think that the first chance tender spot that was to be the basis of the evolution of the eye would have been anything

but a disadvantage that natural selection would have promptly eliminated. What conceivable advantage did nascent organs possess? This sort of difficulty is presented in its most acute form in connexion with speculation about the origin of life. It is known that the same mechanism is used in the most primitive cell as in all others, and in any functioning whatever as a living cell a very complicated chemical reaction in twenty stages is involved, requiring the presence of at least forty, and more probably two or three hundred, exceedingly complicated molecules. That the

stage should thus be so elaborately set for the start of life by pure chance is almost infinitely improbable. Biochemistry would seem strongly to suggest that the Creator is a super-biochemist.

Dr. CLARK notes modestly that the conclusion to which he comes is scientific merely, and not religious. Yet by it faith may be strengthened. For one who has reached it will feel, like Job, that a God who shows this power and skill and care in creation cannot be thought of as dealing carelessly or contemptuously with men.

Literature.

CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

No foreign book on Old Testament interpretation in recent years has excited more discussion than Dr. Wilhelm Vischer's *Das Christuszeugnis des Alten Testaments*. Dr. Vischer is a Swiss pastor who in 1928 became Old Testament lecturer at the Theological School in Bethel-bei-Bielefeld. In 1933 he was forbidden by the Nazis either to preach or to teach. This book was the product of his enforced leisure. In 1936 he returned to Basel, where he combined a pastorate with a lectureship at the University. He now occupies the Chair of Old Testament studies in the French Protestant University of Montpelier.

Part of the *Christuszeugnis* has now been published in an English translation by Mr. A. B. Crabtree, under the title *The Witness of the Old Testament to Christ*, vol. i.: *The Pentateuch* (Lutterworth Press; 25s. net). The dust-cover says of it that 'Dr. Vischer is convinced that the Christian can use the Old Testament not merely to point a moral or adorn a tale, but to preach the Christ of God.'

It is in many ways a difficult, a puzzling, and an enigmatical book, and the present reviewer must confess that he finds in it much that is obscure and uninviting. This may be because he has for years approached the Old Testament as a historian rather than as a dogmatic theologian. It may be, therefore, that he has a blind eye for what is luminously clear to others. Yet he would say without hesitation that the book ought at least to be available for the scrutiny of English readers. Moreover, like the theology of Karl Barth—by which it is obviously influenced—the book was born out of conditions which we in this country can only imperfectly apprehend. 'The new orientation which Karl Barth has brought

into Protestant theology constrains and helps us to-day to interpret the Bible once again as the Bible in its own characteristic sense, however strange this may seem to our modern ways of thought' (p. 29). Probably the book will attract those who have Barthian leanings and repel those who have not.

Dr. Vischer bases his method of interpretation upon the given fact of the unity of the Testaments. 'Through His death Christ has transformed the two into one.' In a striking figure he speaks of 'the witnesses of the Old Testament and those of the New standing facing each other like the two sections of an antiphonal choir looking towards a central point. . . . At this point stands as an historical event Immanuel, God-with-us, the Mediator between God and man, whose life forms that event of world history through which run, as through one point, all lines joining God to any and every man at any time and place.' The Church of Christ links the ages and runs through all centuries before and after Christ, sharing one salvation and upheld by one Mediator. Abraham lived, let us say, 1950 years before Christ, and we live 1950 years after Him. But 'in every generation every true Christian is contemporaneous with Christ,' and therefore, by implication, all 'Christians' are contemporaries and may speak the same language one to another. If I am not mistaking Dr. Vischer's intention, we may infuse the language and thought of the fulfilment into the language and thought of the earlier promises.

That this is a valid homiletical principle hardly any preacher who takes a text from the Old Testament will deny, though even in preaching it can, if employed too readily, be carried to extremes of fantastic allegorizing. But whether it is valid theology, that is the question. It would be wrong,

I feel, to accuse Dr. Vischer of wholesale allegorizing. He is emphatic that Christianity is an historical revelation, and he shows no hostility to criticism, even though he is largely indifferent to it. At the same time, he goes far beyond what the text may once have meant, and makes it 'mean what it has come to mean' in the light of revelation as a whole. Here is not so much allegorizing, but pure Luther and Calvin, early Protestant exegesis come again. One example must suffice: after quoting Luther to the effect that 'the man' who wrestled with Jacob was Jesus Christ, Dr. Vischer goes on, 'Fantastic though the interpretation may appear, it is in fact conclusive. That is the central miracle attested by all the stories and words of the Bible, that Jesus Christ appeared as a man upon earth to wrestle with men, and to be overcome of them. In Jesus, and only in Him, does the inconceivable happen, that the Almighty gives Himself into the power of men. However fiercely reason may revolt against this, this and nothing else is the message of Jesus the crucified.'

C. R. NORTH.

CHURCH HISTORY BETWEEN THE WARS.

A review has already appeared in these pages (volume lviii. [1946-47] 65) of the first volume of Canon Roger Lloyd's very useful book, planned ten years ago, which tells the story of the Church of England in the present century. The first volume dealt with the first twenty years; the second volume brings the story to the end of the 'thirties—*The Church of England in the Twentieth Century*, volume ii. [1919-39] (Longmans; 18s. 6d. net).

The author has a pleasant and arresting pen, though it tends to discursiveness at times, as one might expect of the pen of a 'ready writer.' He has a remarkably wide and intimate knowledge of his Church and its life, such as comes only from long and loving interest in it. His outlook is correspondingly broad and generous; yet he does not conceal his sympathies, nor is there any reason why he should, with the Catholic movement in the Church of England which owes so much to Newman and the Tractarians. He is conscious of standing so near to the period of history of which he treats that it is unlikely he has seen it in true perspective. He is conscious, too, of having made only a selection from the vast material that lay to his hand.

Even so, it has been a wise and significant selection, and future historians may well find a good quarry in this book. The range of interest covered by the second volume appears at a mere glance at the Table of Contents. Beginning with

the sphere of doctrine, Canon Lloyd notes the remarkable decline of Liberalism in the two decades under review and then proceeds to show the effects of this in the daily life of the Church, which has become less partisan and more centred on the Bible and the Eucharist. Then the relation of the Church to the social order, and in particular to the problem of housing, is considered. Then the state of the parochial clergy, the religious conditions they confronted, the ministries they exercised in town and country. Non-parochial ministries are also considered, not to speak of 'the ministry of architectural suggestion.' Chapters on the witness of the Cathedrals, the search for Christian unity, and missions and Christian community, bring a most interesting record to a close.

Many of Canon Lloyd's judgments, which are frank and incisive, will not win general acceptance. We are content to remark on one point. As in his first volume he seems to have exaggerated the place and influence of Albert Schweitzer in the reaction from the so-called 'nineteenth-century Liberalism' and its modernized portrait of Jesus, so in this volume he seems to have exaggerated the place and influence of Sir Edwyn Hoskyns in the neo-conservative movement in Christian doctrine which was characteristic of the decades between the Wars (and has been of the decade since). Hoskyns' work is known to students of the New Testament in all the churches, and is highly appreciated; but it can hardly be said that it has been influential in the non-Anglican churches; and as for its influence among Anglicans, great as that has been, it is in our opinion (one speaks with the natural hesitation of an outsider) not so great as Canon Lloyd represents it as being. Surely it is too much to say of one single scholar in the great Anglican communion in a period of general theological renaissance that to the ancient terms Bible and Church he has given for Anglicans 'a new content and a new emotional force': 'if to-day we think of the Church as having an ineradicably scriptural basis, and of the Bible as the living Word of the living God, it is largely due to him.'

W. FULTON.

LACTANTIUS.

On many occasions students of patristic literature and of the Early Church must have been moved to gratitude for the publications of the S.P.C.K. The publication of *Lactantius' Epitome of the Divine Institutes*, edited and translated with a commentary by Mr. E. H. Blakeney (S.P.C.K.; 11s. net), has added greatly to the debt we owe to them. There is an extraordinary disregard of that great field of patristic literature

and all its wealth in modern scholarship. It is a notably distressing fact that while the new Oxford Classical Dictionary does mention Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Tertullian and Lactantius himself it does not even mention the names of Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras or Theophilus of Antioch. There is no English edition of Lactantius' *Epitome*, and in his edition Mr. Blakeney has supplied a long-felt want.

If we begin with the faults of this book it is only because they are comparatively slight flaws in a very notable performance. When Mr. Blakeney was describing the thought of Lactantius in his introduction it would have been of very great help if he had given references in the works of Lactantius for the ideas to which he refers. It would further have been of very great value if the Latin text and the English translation had been printed on opposite pages instead of separately. And it would have been of still further help if the commentary had been printed below the text instead of being separately printed at the end of the book. But these are merely faults of arrangement and do not in any way affect the real value of this book.

Lactantius, the 'Christian Cicero' as he has been called, was a writer of amazing erudition. To read him is to be brought into touch with ancient religion and ancient philosophy in all its phases. Mr. Blakeney's chapter headings in the English translation are masterly summaries of contents. We get such chapter headings as: 'The Verdict of the Poets,' 'The Verdict of the Philosophers,' 'The Testimony of the Sibyls,' 'Of the Religious Rites of the Romans,' 'Astrology and Element-Worship,' 'Of the Philosophers, their Sects, and Dissensions.' The text is excellent, and the occasional emendations, which Mr. Blakeney has made, very sound. The translation is more than adequate. The commentary is a most scholarly piece of work. One outstanding feature of the notes is the number of references which they give to Greek and Latin literature and to modern works on the subject of which they treat. Many of these notes have in them all the material that any one would need to write a thesis on the subject to which they refer. The way in which Mr. Blakeney has compressed so much erudition into so small a space is masterly.

At the end of his translation Mr. Blakeney has a poem entitled 'After Reading Lactantius,' written by himself. In it the lines occur:

We prize thy writings, hail
Their calm good sense, the faith that guided them,
Their purity of style, and, mixed therewith,
Those loftier thoughts that shadow forth the
truth.

That is a not undeserved tribute to Lactantius; and the fact that Mr. Blakeney was moved to write this poem shows that in addition to the massive learning which he displays he has also that indispensable qualification for the producing of a great edition of an author—an enthusiasm for him.

All patristic students will be heartily grateful for this book. It is a really notable contribution to the subject. The author is to be heartily congratulated on writing it and the publishers on publishing it at so reasonable a price. Is it too much to hope that the S.P.C.K. will go on and give us further editions, say, of all the Greek and Latin apologists? Even the Loeb Classical Library for all its range and width fails us here, and if the S.P.C.K. will go on to tackle this next on the standard on which Mr. Blakeney has produced this edition of Lactantius' *Epitome*, they will earn and receive the grateful thanks of all whose task it is to study or teach patristic literature.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

THE PENTATEUCH—A PLEA FOR CONSERVATISM

The documentary theory of the Pentateuch is encountering very heavy weather. In Scandinavia it is in dissolution at the hands of scholars who nevertheless date the main editorial process in the post-exilic era. At the other end, ultra-conservatives are confidently demanding a return to something very like the traditional Mosaic authorship. Among these must be reckoned Professor G. Ch. Aalders, D.Theol., of the Free University of Amsterdam, in *A Short Introduction to the Pentateuch* (Tyndale Press; 6s. net).

The book, apart from indexes, contains only a hundred and sixty pages, and is divided into no fewer than eighteen chapters, which hardly allows room for extended argument. There are some twenty pages of history of the discussion, very clearly written. Then the author proceeds to his attack on the Wellhausen theory. He says quite plainly that he 'considers it an honour to profess his belief in the Divine inspiration and entire trustworthiness of Holy Scripture and its supreme authority in matters of faith and conduct . . . and that a scholar who believes in the Divine authority of Holy Scripture is prevented by his belief from reaching any result which is contrary to the infallibility of the Bible.' This, as he confesses, means for him that he is obliged to accept everything in the Pentateuch as a record of actual fact, including such statements as that God 'made Eve from a part of Adam's body,' and that 'the serpent spoke to the woman and seduced her and her husband to sin.' He does not

say whether he believes that the world was created only some six thousand years ago, though presumably he must, since his unquestioning acceptance of the longevity of the antediluvian patriarchs must shut him up to something very like Usher's chronology.

The differences in the use of the Divine names are no criterion for documentary analysis, any more than *Allah* and *Rab* are in the Quran. But has Dr. Aalders considered that *Yahweh* is a personal name, while *Rab* is an epithet? There are no double narratives, even of the creation, and his explanation of the apparent differences is the same as that of the mediæval rabbis. But to say that the tense of the verb 'formed' in Gn 2¹⁹ 'may just as well indicate that it preceded' the 'saying' in v. 18, is surely a grammatical error (the verb is *waw consecutive*). The variety of law-codes is not inconsistent with Mosaic authorship. Deuteronomy does distinguish between priests and Levites, and when it speaks of 'the priests the Levites' it may 'just as well denote the priests as belonging to the tribe of Levi.' Ex 20²⁴ 'certainly does not mean a plurality of sanctuaries; at the most it refers to a multiplicity of altars.' But surely wherever there was an altar there was *ipso facto* a sanctuary!

Dr. Aalders admits that there are a number of post-Mosaic and a-Mosaic in the Pentateuch, and therefore he does not accept without qualification the statement in the Talmud—taken over by the Early Church—that the Pentateuch was entirely the work of Moses. 'The Pentateuch as such is an anonymous work. The original compiler is unknown.' But the final redaction can be dated between the beginning of the reign of Saul and the first seven years of the reign of David.

If everything is so straightforward and free from difficulty as Dr. Aalders will have it, one is left wondering why so many learned and pious men have for so long been led so completely astray. Can it be, as has sometimes been darkly hinted, that God deliberately left Himself obscure in order to tempt our human pride of learning to its fall? In all fairness it must be said that Dr. Aalders never suggests such a thing. He is never bitter, and never censorious. He says that in writing his book he has chiefly in view those who share his own interpretation of what faith in the inspiration of the Bible involves. Whether he will convince others of their error is another matter.

C. R. NORTH

PSYCHOANALYSIS.

The scientific cult of so-called objectivity is one of the chief objects of attack in *The Inner Experience of a Psychoanalyst*, by Dr. Theodor

Reik (Allen and Unwin; 21s. net). The author has no sympathy with those who advocate cold and calm intellectual detachment in the analysis of mental distresses. Sympathetic insight is better than tons of theory, and Dr. Reik is convinced that the only way for the psychiatrist to understand those whom he is treating is that he should first of all—or simultaneously—analyse himself. The discovered unconscious in the doctor-psychologist is the key to the problem-creating disorders of the patient, for, seeing that they are both human, there can, after all be no basic difference between the analyst and the patient. Empathy must indeed be cultivated, but it should not be too consciously induced, it being true in this sphere that it is those who do not seek who are most likely to find. Above all, the psychoanalyst must beware of the jargon and the ready-made formulæ which have smothered the practice of his profession, and have made it too frequently true that 'an expert is one who knows more and more technical terms about less and less.' In an amusing chapter this jargon—called by the author 'psychoanalese'—is cleverly burlesqued, and astonishment is expressed that even more characters from Greek mythology have not been made use of, Œdipus and Narcissus being grossly overworked. The diatribes against conventional methods are in the spirit of Freud, of whom it is said that he 'generally preferred concepts in the field of psychology which nobody took seriously.' The author prefers 'hunches' to text-book prescriptions, artistry to technicalities, and, correspondingly, and more inwardly, he demands moral sincerity and a readiness to face the revelations of the unconscious in the analyst himself even if they shatter complacency.

The book—more than five hundred pages in length—is perhaps overloaded with 'cases,' but they are well described, and help to elucidate the main theme, which is that no one can help others unless he is true to his own experience, conscious that it is better not to understand than to misunderstand, willing to wait for illumination rather than to make use of the clap-trap formulæ of psychoanalytic scholasticism. The book is unhesitatingly iconoclastic in regard to the deities of the author's own profession, but he has the faith that when the little gods go, the great gods will arrive. The message of the book may be summed up in the words of Schiller, 'If thou wouldst understand others, look into thine own heart.'

W. S. URQUHART.

It would be sheer impertinence to commend *The Private Devotions of Lancelot Andrewes*, which, of course, is a spiritual classic, the

immortality of which appears assured. Originally written in Greek, for his own eyes and heart and soul alone, by the scholar chosen to be chairman of the committee responsible for translating Genesis to Kings in the Authorised Version of the Bible, happily these prayers did not die with their author, but were ultimately published, and have exercised, who can sum up, how widespread a ministry.

In his day John Henry Newman translated them. And here is a really beautiful edition of his work, published by the Abingdon-Cokesbury Press (\$1.25).

No doubt there are still disciples saying to Christ, 'Lord, teach us to pray.' His answer to them might well be to direct them to this soul-searching and memorable book—for the first time, or for the hundredth time.

A well-illustrated little book under the title, *Health is our Adventure* (Church Missionary Society; 3s. net), has been written by Dr. Gladys Jeffree, telling of the efforts of medical missionaries in almost every part of the world to adapt their work to fundamental necessities. She uses the phrase 'perpetual pioneering' to symbolize her appeal for adaptation, and goes all out in stressing the value of village work as compared with the running of institutional hospitals. She believes in the gospel for the 'whole man,' and so has much to say about preventive medicine and agricultural improvement. Her main theme is that if people will not—or cannot—come to us as medical missionaries, we must go to them.

There are some who can keep diaries and some who can't. For those who do, here is a book that should appeal to them, all about their hobby, written out of fullness of knowledge by a shrewd mind and with a vivid pen—*Self-Harvest: A Study of Diaries and the Diarist*, by Mr. P. A. Spalding (Independent Press; 6s. net).

Inevitably there is talk about Boswell, Pepys, Evelyn and the like. But less notable personalities also come upon the scene, of some of whom most of us know little or nothing.

The starting-point is a quotation from Boswell. 'I should live no more than I can record, as one should not have more corn growing than one can get in. There is a waste of good if it be not preserved.' That is the born diarist speaking; and for many of us it is very questionable if the thing is true. But that text gives the atmosphere to the whole little book; and round it an ingenious and pleasant essay has been written.

Canon J. E. Fison of Rochester in *The Blessing of the Holy Spirit* (Longmans; paper edition

5s. 6d., cloth edition 8s. 6d. net) has issued under this title a very vigorous and scholarly assessment of the present-day situation of the Christian Church, whose desperate need it is, he argues, to rediscover the Holy Spirit's blessing. Liberal Protestantism has lost touch with the supernatural, and there is an arrested development of religion at the ethical and intellectual level; evangelical pietism and catholic mysticism have lost touch with the natural, and there is a by-passing of the ethical and intellectual. There is a similar pattern of development in the doctrine of the Spirit in both Old and New Testaments (and the main part of this book treats of the Biblical theology of the Spirit). Among the perils besetting the Christian Church of to-day (as in the early days) are those of idolatry and apostasy, in which the Holy Spirit is dethroned from the Godhead: 'the idolater tends to sharpen the distinction between natural and supernatural, the apostate blurs this distinction.' Only in the Holy Spirit, it is here contended, are the natural and the supernatural truly held together and yet distinct. In the somewhat difficult concluding chapter the gateway to the fullness of the Divine blessing is represented as holy baptism into the Triune Name.

Such is the fame and usefulness of the late Hans Lietzmann's 'History of the Early Church,' which was translated into English about twelve years ago by Dr. Bertram Lee Woolf, that a second English edition is now called for. Recently we welcomed the appearance in revised form of the first volume, 'The Beginnings of the Christian Church'; it dealt with the first two centuries. We now welcome the appearance, again in revised form, of the second volume—*The Founding of the Church Universal* (Lutterworth Press; 21s. net). It deals with the period which ends with the death of Origen (A.D. 253-4). The next volume will be 'From Constantine to Julian.' There will be five volumes in all. The book is very attractive in form and is likely to remain for long a standard history of its subject. The chapter titles of the volume here noticed should give our readers a sufficient impression of the scope of treatment: 'The World Empire of Rome,' 'The Church,' 'The New Testament,' 'Theology and the Rule of Faith,' 'Worship,' 'Christianity Face to Face with the World,' 'The Apologists,' 'Asia Minor and the Montanist Movement,' 'Gaul,' 'Africa,' 'Rome,' 'Syria and Beyond,' 'Egypt.' Specially notable are the studies of Tertullian, Clement, and Origen.

A few months ago the first volume of *Arnobius of Sicca: The Case Against the Pagans* (Newman

Bookshop, Westminster, Maryland; \$3.25) was reviewed in our columns. We welcome now the second and completing volume. It is a continuation of the first, even as to pagination. It gives an excellent translation of Books 4-7, followed by over sixty pages of Notes, and a full index. Dr. G. E. McCracken has done an excellent bit of work, which, it may be expected, will constitute for long the best edition of Arnobius in the English language.

Three lectures, delivered in St. Mary's, Oxford, by the Rev. Mervyn Stockwood have been published under the title *Christianity and Marxism* (S.P.C.K.; 2s. net). In them Mr. Stockwood gives a simple and straightforward analysis of Marxism and its relationship to Christianity. His treatment is not very original, but he draws attention to certain obvious defects in the Christian attitude to Communism, suggesting an analogy with the earlier obscurantist attitude to science. He has himself strongly Socialist leanings, and exposes the tendency in organized Christianity to fix attention on the individual and uphold the *status quo*. His chief indictment of Communism is that it is too purely environmental, takes account only of the materialistic side of human nature, relies on the inevitability of progress toward the classless society, minimizes the need of unselfishness, and overlooks the necessity for the regeneration of the individual as well as of society.

The Doctor's Profession, edited by Mr. Daniel T. Jenkins (S.C.M.; 4s. 6d. net), is the second book which has been published in close association with the discussions of the Christian Frontier Council, and is a worthy successor, in its own sphere, to Sir Walter Moberley's 'Crisis in the University.' There is in it much shrewd observation and careful reasoning. It is a pity, perhaps, that a rather dogmatic statement about suffering being ultimately due to sin, should appear on an early page, for, although the dictum might be safeguarded by an adequate interpretation of 'ultimately,' its face meaning will be apt to antagonize unnecessarily many for whom the book is intended. Otherwise the book treats most excellently of several vital problems with ethical import, such as, amongst others, the use of contraceptives and the legitimacy of euthanasia. But the value of the book is in its more general discussion of topics such as the relation of the doctor to the State Service, in regard to which the author advocates a fair trial and the avoidance of too much sentimentality over the disappearance of the doctor-patient relationship. He pays a generous tribute to the influence of medical missions on the medical profession as a whole. The chapters on medical education and

psychiatry are wholly admirable. The author thinks that the old saying 'Scratch a doctor and find an atheist' is only very partially true, but urges that a better general education would liberate young medical students from the out-of-date and narrow materialism with which they are confronted at the outset of their specialized studies. An interesting point he makes is that medicine is almost the only science that in recent years has avoided ethical neutrality and has remained beneficent, and he attributes this to the fact that the profession has inherited a tradition which stresses wide responsibility to the community and refuses to allow that the doctor can ever be a mere technician. The book is so good that one regrets there is not more of it.

The late Dr. Stuart C. Parker, who was for many years the greatly valued minister of one of the leading churches in Toronto, linked together this series of sermons—*Jesus Stresses a Point* (Thorn Press, Toronto; \$1.25)—by basing them on Jesus' use of the word 'verily,' sometimes simply and sometimes duplicated, but always with emphasis. The stress is intended to draw attention either to what is so commonplace as to breed indifference or so startling as to appear incredible. Dr. Parker argues that what was specially important for Jesus must have importance for us to-day, and under the guidance of the principle of selection indicated, he has produced a group of addresses distinguished by clarity of thought, evangelical earnestness and practical application, and containing many passages of striking eloquence and beauty of expression.

Mr. I. H. Rubenstein of the Illinois Bar, has compiled a treatise 'to clarify and state the civil and criminal legal aspects of the major polemical tenets of fortune-telling, faith-healing, and pacifism.' The book is entitled, *A Treatise on Contemporary Religious Jurisprudence* (Waldain Press, Chicago; \$2.50). The three things aforementioned come into conflict with the Law of any civilized State, the first when it leads to conflict with public morality; the second when it infers a charge of manslaughter because, for example, a parent's religious belief that medical advice is not to be sought may be the cause of a child's death, or contribute to the spread of an epidemic; the third because if it be propagandist in a national crisis it is contrary to national safety. The author pays attention mainly to the Law of the U.S.A., but does not neglect Britain, Australia, or Canada. It is a book which breaks new ground, and is not only interesting but important. We are desirous to make known that it may be ordered from the Waldain Press, P.O. Box 97, Chicago 90, Ill.

Theological Issues Involved in Baptism.

BY THE REVEREND J. K. S. REID, B.D., EDINBURGH.

AN article bearing the title 'Some Important Issues for Baptismal Theology' appeared in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for January 1950. The writer of it is to be thanked for a vigorous statement of some of the thoughts to which his reflection on the matter led him, and this magazine itself merits gratitude for taking up a subject of such pressing practical and therefore theological concern to churches of all denominations. Whether in fact the important issues involved really emerged in this article is more open to question; and no friend of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES would, I fancy, wish the idea to get about that this article represents all that should be said on the subject, or that even most of the factors to be taken into account in any discussion were expressed by it.

It is my intention to try to present some of the issues that did not come to light in the article in question, and I do not wish to discuss the article point by point except in so far as it helps to this end.

(1) And first, the issue does not take the form of a choice between 'Believers' Baptism' and Infant Baptism. It is rather whether or not the 'Believers' Baptism' of New Testament times then or later rightly led to Infant Baptism. It is really very surprising that this should require to be said at all. But a number of writings, among which the article giving rise to this discussion is one, convey the impression that those who advocate Infant Baptism do so to the exclusion of 'Believers' Baptism.' It is then held that if 'Believers' Baptism' can be shown to possess any value it is *ipso facto* an argument against Infant Baptism. This is to misread the case, unless 'Believers' Baptism' be defined in contrast to Adult Baptism. A glance at the formularies of the churches, such as *The Book of Common Prayer* (which talks of the administration of Baptism to 'such as are of riper years') or *The Book of Common Order* (administration to 'adults') would immediately show that the churches concerned certainly advocate and practise Adult Baptism. While those who advocate 'Believers' Baptism' cannot allow Infant Baptism, those who hold that Infant Baptism is justifiable do not deny the legitimacy of Adult Baptism (or, unless it be sharply distinguished, of 'Believers' Baptism'). It is therefore impossible to apply the advantages and values of Adult Baptism to damage the case for Infant Baptism.

There is, however, some confusion of terms here,

which ought to be cleared up. Adult Baptism and 'Believers' Baptism' are (I think) sometimes used to denote not the same but quite different conceptions of the meaning of Baptism. Adult Baptism then is practised by churches which advocate Infant Baptism as the regular and usual procedure, and is held to apply to an adult and believing person the benefits already conferred on others in infancy. 'Believers' Baptism' is practised by those who construe Baptism (and in particular the place of faith in Baptism) in such a way as to render it inapplicable to infants.

This is exemplified by the article in question, where it is stated that Baptism 'is primarily a declaration of faith,' that it is so 'in precisely the same sense in which the Lord's Supper is a "showing forth" of the Lord's death,' and that 'both ordinances equally are teaching ordinances, dramatic representations on the model of Old Testament "acted prophecy."' Many churchmen regard this kind of view as a really disastrous impoverishment of what the Church historically and as a whole has understood the Sacraments to be. The meagre subjectivism here exhibited is a grave disturbance of the balance between the Divine and the human parts played in their celebration. Such 'showing forth' is certainly a most important part of sacramental celebration. But the eucharistic 'showing forth' is logically subsequent to the fact of the 'real presence' of Christ ('This is my body,' etc.), and without this content the only thing shown forth is that some people happen to retain the memory of Jesus' death. Similarly that faith is declared in Baptism no one so far as I know is concerned to deny; but it is a very different thing to maintain that Baptism is *primarily* declaration of faith. On the contrary, it chiefly declares the grace of God; and it does even this only in a secondary sense, since the intention is not only to declare but also actually to convey and apply this Divine grace.

In fact those who advocate 'Believers' Baptism' alone, do not require to hold quite so meagre a view of Baptism as is here maintained. They can justly hold that real grace is applied in the celebration of a Sacrament, along with its declaratory significance. The difference of opinion between them and those who advocate Infant Baptism along with Adult Baptism then shifts to another point, without, however, being dissolved. Different views are then taken of the conditions

under which the grace is conveyed and applied. This issue will be discussed at a later point.

(2) The second issue which it seems worth while presenting concerns the scriptural basis of Baptism. To show that one of the forms of Baptism current in the churches to-day can claim scriptural authority is, of course, not really to discredit the others. We must decline to take seriously such a statement as the earlier article on this subject contained: 'The issue is no longer whether Believers' Baptism has scriptural authority, but whether this matters.' In the quarters where the doctrine of Baptism is being carefully scrutinized, the question of scriptural authority is of first-class concern, and one begins to doubt the reliability of the guidance of any one who overlooks this.

Adult Baptism of course makes a ready claim to scriptural authority and precedent. With pentecostal power, the proclamation of what God in Christ had done for men broke through Jewish disbelief, heathen superstition, and religious indifference. It suddenly impinged upon men at all stages in life, just as it caught them in every social status. Adult Baptism was in the earliest days of Christianity the rule, as it has subsequently been the rule wherever the Gospel has been proclaimed in hitherto unchristian lands or areas. In the nature of the case, the Book of Acts records case after case of Adult Baptism. But, it must be repeated, proof of the entirely scriptural character of Adult Baptism does nothing to damage the case for Infant Baptism. It is in fact the basis of the scriptural authority to which Infant Baptism can also lay claim.

The proposition that Infant Baptism is also scriptural cannot be dismissed with the cavalier phrase that 'such claims can hardly stand.'¹ The claim must be properly argued on the basis of such evidence as is available. This has most recently been done by Oscar Cullmann in an admirable study, *Tauflehre des Neuen Testaments*, shortly to be published in English by the S.C.M. Press. It must be allowed that the supposition of infants being included under the 'households'

¹ The whole phrase runs as follows: 'such claims can hardly stand against the authoritative opinions of the expositors already named.' Unfortunately a number at least of these make no reference to the practice of Infant Baptism at the places cited. For example Sanday and Headlam (*Romans [ICC]*, 53 f., 162 f.) discuss the meaning of Baptism in general, whether applied to infants or to adults and believers, and at one point at least (p. 107) suggest the likelihood of the practice of Infant Baptism from the use of the term *σφραγίς*. Similarly C. H. Dodd (*Romans [Moffatt N. T. Commentary]*, 136) specifically declares that the validity of Infant Baptism is simply not in question.

stated in the New Testament to have been baptized, however probable, is incapable of complete proof. But on the other hand it is to be observed that there is not a single case of the Baptism of a person born of Christian parents being deliberately postponed until adulthood. On the level of explicit scriptural evidence, then, the case is not nearly so one-sided as the advocates of 'Believers' Baptism' make out.

Even this, however, is not all. The issue here is not (as it is so often made out to be) Scripture *versus* tradition. In the nature of things, the situation suffered gradual but radical change with the development of first-generation Christianity into second-generation Christianity. The issue is therefore whether in face of this change the Church rightly interpreted the meaning of Baptism, even supposing no infants had in the earliest days received Baptism. It is in this context that the significance of the use of the passage Mt 19¹⁴ ('Suffer little children . . . to come unto me' etc.) becomes clear. No one so far as I know suggests that the dominical words directly refer to Baptism. Nor need it be assumed that the words were afterwards used to justify a practice which people questioned but which the Church (for some obscure reason) desired to maintain against every possible argument. The words have rather this kind of application, that the Church, guided by reflection upon the nature of Baptism, and no doubt partly by mature consideration of these words, was led to practise Infant Baptism. The answer to the inquiry whether the Church was rightly led can be found only by appealing to more profound considerations of the nature of Baptism which are put forward below. Oscar Cullmann is abundantly justified in defending Infant Baptism, not by the precedent of our Lord or even of primitive Church practice, but by the doctrine of Baptism itself. It certainly cannot be settled by the surprisingly naïve device (used in the article under consideration) of ascribing a certain teaching about Baptism to the Apostles, and writing off all apparent scriptural evidence for Infant Baptism as impossible on the grounds that the practice and the teaching of the Apostles would then contradict each other.

(3) The writer of the article which is here in mind does realize something of the third issue which it seems necessary to present. His words are: 'Believers' Baptism stands sharply opposed to Infant Baptism in its conception of Divine grace.' I think that this is unfortunately true. What is involved here is best explained by putting two questions: first, in what sense is Baptism initiation?; and second, what is the place of faith in Baptism?

Baptism on the catholic view is real initiation.

It is by Baptism that a person enters the Christian Church and the fellowship of the household of faith. The writer of the article makes it very difficult for us to suppose that Baptism has any clear or special significance of this kind. If Baptism is really 'primarily a declaration of faith,' if it is 'an act of obedience,' if it 'expresses . . . the truth of conversion' and 'finally . . . is a means of grace' in which God 'answers faith with assurance,' it is difficult or impossible to understand why a Christian should not be baptized again and again, 'in precisely the same sense in which the Lord's Supper' is repeated again and again. But in fact the writer does not speak representatively of others who, like him, hold to 'Believers' Baptism' alone. Those others would hold that a real beginning is made, that in other words a real initiation takes place; and Baptism is for this reason not susceptible of repetition.

But the question dividing the advocates of 'Believers' Baptism' from those of Infant Baptism is still to be faced: How or on what conditions does this initiation take place? The answer given by the first is: The boon conveyed in Baptism is conferred only on condition of faith already present and declared on the part of the person being baptized; the answer of the second is: The baptismal boon is conferred at the very beginning of the Christian life, before ever confession of faith is made, and, whatever condition is demanded, it is certainly not that of a declared faith on the part of the person being baptized.

In fact, the difference here is not merely one of the time of the conferring of the baptismal benefits. The difference in time implies a concealed difference in the nature of the benefits Baptism is believed to bestow. Some phrases of the article before us will make this clear. For the writer 'every worthy doctrine of the Church assumes its members to be Christians in faith, practice, and profession'; those to whom Baptism is applied must apparently be 'religiously competent'; and 'grace is God's action in a soul made voluntarily susceptible to Divine influence by personal repentance and faith.' This makes it clear that the grace of Baptism is applied long after the Christian life has well begun (and this, even if we discount the extravagance of the language here used). No wonder then if the grace be supposed to be merely 'the supernatural inflow of enriching resources into the surrendered and trustful heart.' It thus appears that the initiation of the Christian life and much of its growth is entirely independent of Baptism, and therefore of such grace as Baptism conveys. No doubt it could alongside of this be maintained that the beginning of the Christian

life, the 'surrendered heart,' the 'religious competence' that are all required before Baptism is applied, are the work of God, though the writer never raises this evidently important question. But it is certain that baptismal grace plays no part in producing them.

Baptism so regarded forfeits all claim to be a genuinely *Christian* initiation, though the claim that it is so is advanced in its favour in the article. The emphasis upon 'voluntary susceptibility' and 'surrender' as precondition of Baptism assimilates the rite to the secular type of initiation ceremony, just as it surrenders the thought of the prevenience of God's grace—or, if not actually abandoning it, at least excludes it from the sphere of baptismal grace.

To those who advocate Infant Baptism this is a very serious mutilation of the conception of grace. If persons are to receive grace only when they are already 'spiritually conditioned by faith in the gospel to receive it,' where, it must be asked, can the Christian life make a start at all?

Thus it appears once more that, since the real start is made elsewhere, Baptism so regarded is not real Christian initiation at all.

(4) The fourth issue to be raised here has already been mentioned. It is the place of faith in Baptism. It was said above that no one advocates Baptism unconditionally; and those, who deny that personal faith in the person baptized is the right definition of the conditions required, must not be held to mean that faith is dispensable. Infant Baptism is of course administered to the 'children of Believers.' I find it quite extraordinary that such a thing need be said at all. But the writer of the article in question says that 'this [analogy of Jewish circumcision], of course, could justify only the Baptism of children from Christian homes'—as though the advocates of Infant Baptism had any intention of applying Infant Baptism to others than the children of Christian parents. I know of no one to-day who admires Charlemagne's reputed use of a hosepipe to baptize the Franks, or imitates the missionaries mentioned by Barth who baptized whole Indian villages by means of a firehose.

But that faith must be active in the administration of Baptism is firmly maintained by the advocates of Infant Baptism. The locus of this faith, however, is not in the person to be baptized. Calvin, it is true, hedges when he poses to himself the question whether there is such a thing as faith in an infant, and finally he leaves judgment in the matter suspended. But the demand for faith is always made in Baptism. This demand, in the case of an adult, takes the form of a profession of faith, and this the advocates of Infant Baptism willingly concede. But in the case of

infants, it takes a different form. Faith in their case is both present and future, both actual and expected. The faith present is the faith of the parents or sponsors, or of the congregation gathered and praying. One hesitates to use the term 'vicarious' of this faith, since it is not clear that faith can be vicariously held or applied. Elsewhere I use the term 'altruistic' to describe it (*Scottish Journal of Theology*, iii. 2). It is this faith of which the Apostles' Creed is the recognized expression and to which the sponsors (and often, as in the Scottish rite, the congregation too) give assent.

But there is also an 'expected' faith, what may perhaps be called a 'proleptic' faith. Cullmann (*op. cit.*) shows with a force that the present writer finds compelling, that, where Baptism is administered to one not capable of a profession of faith, it is always done 'with a view to future faith.' Baptism is not rendered nugatory by the absence of faith in the person baptized; it is frustrated only if neither in the present nor the future does faith emerge. In point of fact, this has been at least implicitly recognized in the Communions where Confirmation follows Baptism at the appropriate time. For then the baptized person, come to years of responsibility and decision, not only ratifies what was earlier done for him, but procures confirming grace.

Whether this, as the writer of the article inspiring this supplement alleges, involves a 'difference of status' between the children of Christians and of non-Christians appears to be a matter of definition. Are we to regard the choice of Israel as 'conferring spiritual privilege' upon the people? The answer is that the Jews did so *misunderstand* it to involve spiritual privilege rather than responsibility. But it is quite unimportant whether one cares to call the difference between called and not called a 'difference of status.' And in view of the affinity between circumcision and Baptism, the really surprising thing would be had the Early Church not carried over whatever is involved in this difference to differentiate the children of believers and those of unbelievers.

Equally surprising I always find the allegation that Infant Baptism involves a 'non-ethical interpretation of the gospel.' This, the writer holds, is one of the 'issues involved.' There is indeed something admirable about the pugnacious desire to defend the individual responsibility of the person which (I suppose) inspires this allegation. But the defence must be conducted on

right lines and not on wrong. Even its defenders have to remember religiously that the mysteries of personality and responsibility are bound up with our relationship to God; philosophically that personality develops in contact with persons; biologically that Robinson Crusoe was not born alone upon his famous island; and ethically that no one ever asked to be born at all. One would be more convinced of the presence here of a 'non-ethical interpretation of the gospel' if he thought those who used this phrase could really tell him when an infant becomes the bearer of ethical attributes. The grace of God in Baptism stakes claim upon this (as one may call it) ethical and spiritual no man's land, and operates within it through such ethical means as the case allows—the Christian influence of parents, sponsors, and Church—until at Confirmation, by a profession of faith, the territory is declared voluntarily to be made over to Christ, and Christ's rights in it are ratified.

Let it be really allowed that grace alone can so work in a man's heart that he 'confess that Jesus Christ is Lord,' then those who advocate 'Believers' Baptism' only must either think of grace as being of two kinds, one sacramental and the other extra-sacramental, or reduce the Sacrament of Baptism to a public recognition that grace has been at work—a mere 'declaration' without real efficacy. Those on the other hand who advocate Infant Baptism believe that God makes available His grace at the very outset of a human life, and really applies it in Holy Baptism where faith, being already present in the sponsors, is the best external guarantee of a future profession of faith by the person baptized.

(5) There is no room to say more than a word about a fifth important issue. It is the question of the conditions under which Infant Baptism may rightly be administered. Where misunderstanding about the meaning of Baptism is cleared up, this remains a point where clarification is needed. It can only lead to confusion if *administrative difficulties* are allowed to menace the *validity* of the Sacrament. If this is conceded, the principle ought to be clearly affirmed, that the conditions are for the sake of the Sacrament, not the Sacrament for the sake of the conditions. The conditions to be fulfilled may then be firm, but they must not be so formulated as irresponsibly and needlessly to restrict the conferring of the inestimable benefits of Holy Baptism. This thesis is developed at length in an article in the *Scottish Journal of Theology*, iii. 2.

Doctrine of Man.

Marx on Man.

BY THE REVEREND EDWARD ROGERS, M.A., B.D., SOUTHPORT.

It is becoming increasingly common for debating societies and study groups, desiring to grapple with 'the problems of the age,' to arrange debates between Christians and Communists. All too often they are sorry spectacles. The Christian spokesman vigorously attacks 'crude materialism,' which Communism is not. The Communist selects from his catena a few rousing quotations to ridicule 'naïve idealism,' which Christianity is not. The contenders rarely get near enough to each other to make a real fight of it; which is a pity, because the Marxist doctrine of man must be fought for the sake of man. There is a passage in the Report of the 1948 Lambeth Committee on 'The Christian Doctrine of Man' which merits the careful study of Christian apologists. 'The most highly organized, consistent, powerful, and destructive form of secularism is beyond doubt Dialectical Materialism, and the type of Communism in which it is embodied. This is perhaps the one live alternative to the Christian interpretation of man. Between the two there can be no compromise; and it seems to be increasingly probable that it is between these two that the world must choose. Neutral positions may not long be tenable. No presentation of the Christian world-view can command the assent of the rising generation unless it has squarely come to grips with the dogmas of Dialectical Materialism. For Marxism, by an ironic paradox, is at some points nearer to the Christian doctrine than any other philosophy in the field, and this makes its rivalry all the more formidable' (*Lambeth 1948*, Part ii. p. 4).

The trouble is, of course, that the dogmas of Dialectical Materialism seem to belong so much to another world of thought that it is exceedingly difficult for the Christian to come squarely to grips with them. The Marxist has the disconcerting habit of exercising Humpty Dumpty's prerogative: 'When *I* use a word it means just what *I* choose it to mean—neither more nor less.' But when the special language of the dialectic has been mastered, we discover that we are considering a close-knit and brilliantly argued total doctrine of man which has proved itself able to win the consent of honest and intelligent men. The contest with Marxist ideology is a priority of Christian apologetics; but let there be no delusion about it: it is a real fight and no mere casual skirmish against an ill-equipped adversary.

I propose, therefore, with a bare minimum of comment, to summarize the relevant aspects of the Marxist teaching; and begin where Marx began. As a young man, attracted to the study of philosophy, he accepted the 'enlightened' opinion of his generation that the Christian religion was finished. The labours of the scholars had proved that the so-called historical foundation of the Gospels was a myth. They were, in fact, comparatively late community creations clustered round a typical and probably non-existent hero. Useful enough in their own day, they were now outdated, and only the uninstructed or ignorant could take them seriously. The urgent task of the philosopher was to propound an acceptable and reasonable alternative.

Hegel had cleared the way with his fundamental proposition that the entire universal process must be rationally understood and cannot be irrational. Hegel's clue to the understanding of the process, the reconciliation of opposites (the dialectic) was a discovery of supreme importance. But the thesis that only the Absolute has (or is) complete reality, and the consequent assertion that all we can do is to watch the unfolding of unpredictable reality in experience—'the owl of Minerva begins its flight when the shades of twilight have already fallen'—Marx held to be nonsense. Feuerbach had laid hold of the truth in his insistence on the objective reality of the material world, but had gone astray through over-emphasizing crude mechanistic materialism. Somewhere between Hegel and Feuerbach was the truth.

The obvious thing to do, says Marx, is to start with an obvious and undeniable fact of experience. Not with the cosmic mystery of an unfolding Absolute, or with any unverifiable theories about 'spirit'; but with a bare and simple fact about man. One thing which is true of every man, farmer or philosopher, and which has been constantly verified by experience, is that he has to eat to live. Man is a material creature. He may be a good deal more than that, but there is where we start. The organization of human societies—family, clan, tribe, or nation—is directed towards the provision of material necessities; and if that is not done the society automatically perishes. Good music and great literature can make life very pleasant; but nobody would last for very long on a diet confined to good music and great literature.

The material necessities of human existence are of primary importance; for without them there would be no existence.

We must, therefore, reckon man as a part of Nature, as belonging to this material world. To use a typical phrase, he is a 'concrete, actual being.' But in his struggle for existence he has developed mind as an increasingly useful tool and weapon. It needs to be emphasized, in view of the current misconceptions of the nature of Marxist materialism, that the rôle of intelligence in human affairs is nowhere underrated. If anything, it is overrated! But mind is never set in opposition to matter. It is matter in motion; it is never found divorced from matter; and it is always expressed through matter. 'The material, sensuously perceptible world to which we ourselves belong,' says Marx, 'is the only reality. . . . Our consciousness and thinking, however supra-sensuous they may seem, are the product of mind, but mind itself is merely the highest product of matter' (*Selected Works*, Eng. ed., i, 430-31).

The establishment, in this world, of changing social communities is a direct consequence of the pressure of material necessity. 'Social,' because the provision of necessities is made much easier by the division of labour and economic co-operation. 'Changing,' because the organization of human society is never fully satisfactory, and change is the only way to resolve the inner contradictions of society. The change is not necessarily gradual. It is more likely to be violent: a sudden leap forward when the contradictions come to breaking-point. But the thesis now established is that history, the story of man, is a story of changing social communities.

The next question is: is it *merely* the story of change? Is it a record of contingency and chance, a chronological conglomeration of haphazard incident, the story of a hopeless quest; or is there any discernible development and process? There is process, says Marx, and, what is more important, we can explain and understand it with the help of those simple facts with which we began. Men in society cannot be regarded as collections of atomistic individuals. The very fact that they are 'in society' has not only profound psychological effects, but it means also that they are involved in social and economic 'laws' which operate independently of desire. Because we are dealing with men in the totality of their social relationships, we are dealing with deducible and analysable laws.

No insurance company, for instance, has secret information as to who is going to die next week or next year; but, taking the country as a statistical whole, they can reasonably calculate the number of people of different ages who will die within the year. If I empty a bucket of fine sand I have no

idea where any individual grain will rest; but I know that the whole mass will form a rough cone. So, given a mass of men in social and economic relationship, I can discover laws which belong to that relationship and which condition the historic changes in that relationship. And as there are no solitary individuals, and as the nature of concrete actual man is conditioned by the form of his social relationships, these changes involve corresponding changes in human nature.

'In the social production of their means of existence'—to quote the most celebrated exposition of this idea—'men enter into definite necessary relations which are independent of their will, productive relationships which correspond to a definite stage of development of their material productive forces. The aggregate of these productive relationships constitutes the economic structure of society, the real basis on which a juridical and political superstructure arises, and to which definite forms of social consciousness correspond. The mode of production of the material means of existence conditions the whole process of social, political, and intellectual life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, it is their social existence that determines their consciousness' (Preface to Marx's *Critique of Political Economy*).

So, in *Capital*, Marx undertook to show how, as an inevitable consequence of its inner contradictions, the capitalist order of society was not merely bound to come to an end, but was bound to come to an end in such a way and for such reasons that the next phase of human society could be intelligently anticipated. The Labour Theory of Value, the theory of the exploitation of surplus value, the law of concentration of capital, the law of increasing misery, and the class struggle: all point clearly to the next and *higher* stage of social development. For the dialectical process means that the contradictions of one phase of human society can only be resolved by a reorganization of productive forces which more efficiently solves the problems posed by material necessity.

But surely, it may be objected, this argument is leading to a theory of blind, automatic development; taking away the last shred of dignity from man. To which the answer is returned that it is an objective description of our present situation. Here Engels speaks most clearly: 'The history of social development is essentially different in one respect from that of nature. In nature—in so far as we disregard the reaction of man upon it—there exist only unconscious, blind agents which influence one another and through whose reciprocal interplay general laws assert themselves. Whatever occurs . . . does not occur as a consciously

willed end. On the other hand, in social history the active agents are always endowed with consciousness, are always men working towards definite ends with thought and passion. But this difference . . . does not alter the fact that the course of history obeys general laws. . . . Only seldom does that occur which is willed. In most cases the numerous ends which are willed conflict with or cut across one another, or they are doomed from the very outset to be unattainable, or the means to carry them out are insufficient. And so . . . there arises in the social world a situation which is quite analogous to that in the unconscious, natural one. The ends of actions are willed ; but the results, which really flow from those actions, are not willed, or, in so far as the results seem to agree with the willed ends, ultimately they turn out to be quite other than the desired consequence' (quoted from *Ludwig Feuerbach*, in S. Hook, *Towards the Understanding of Karl Marx*, 106-7).

This, however, is far from being the end of the story. The fact that man now understands the working of the process puts him in an entirely new relationship to it. He can never be independent of it ; but he can become its master and cease to be its slave. Men can fly in machines that are heavier than air, can apparently defy Nature, because they have come to understand and accept physical laws. When men will accept the limitations of their material nature, will understand and abide consciously by sociological law, they will become the directors of the dialectical process guiding mankind to its glorious destiny.

Here is a working faith for man, or rather, a working science ; offering assurance in the place of wistful longing. 'The science of the history of society, despite all the complexity of the phenomena of social life, can become as precise a science as, let us say, biology, and capable of making use of the laws of development of society for practical purposes. . . . Hence, Socialism is converted from a dream of a better future for humanity into a science' (J. Stalin, *Problems of Leninism*, 578). The glory that awaits man is such that, in our present condition, we can only dimly guess at its splendour. 'With men as they are, a withering away of the State is inconceivable. In speculating on a radical and inmost change of human nature, we pass beyond the borders of empirical research and enter the realm of prophetic vision where the true significance and providential destination of man are circumscribed in stammering metaphors' (Eduard Heimann, quoted in M. Buber, *Paths in Utopia*, 11).

The comment of the Lambeth Committee, that 'Marxism is at some points nearer to the Christian doctrine than any other philosophy in the field,' is obviously true. Both emphasize the objective

reality of the material world. Both deal with man, not in isolated individuality, but in his relatedness. Both believe that history is not meaningless but purposive. Both look to a glory yet to be revealed, that eye hath not seen nor ear heard. But the ground of one, and this makes all the difference, is ultimately in the merciful majesty of God. The ground of the other is in the intelligence of man.

The secret of the appeal of Marxist doctrine is not very far to seek. It is, essentially, a straightforward rationalist, humanistic, 'scientific' teaching ; not cluttered up with irrelevant hang-overs of pious morality or Christian exhortation. It stands squarely on its own ground. It appeals to the creative sense of man ; to the feeling that if will and knowledge were united great things could be done that have been left undone—a legitimate feeling which a torpid, conventional, please-don't-let's-make-a-fuss Christianity has too often frustrated. And it ministers very subtly to the pride of sinful man. But the vital question is this : Is the ground on which it stands so squarely solid ground ?

The first critical point I would make is that Marx, like a great many other well-intentioned people who have done incalculable harm, was very deeply interested in man and very slightly interested in men. It is typical, for instance, that the Labour Theory of Value, which is of fundamental importance in the development of his thought, is built upon 'an undifferentiated jelly of socially necessary labour-units,' not upon working men. That recondite abstraction, over the meaning of which the scholars still contend with well-assumed surprise at each other's ignorance, was deliberately designed to take thought away from Tom or Alice or Sergei. We are not concerned with exploited individuals or with wicked capitalists : we are concerned with the unfolding of an economic process in which class groups are inextricably involved. The centre of attention is the Process. The victim-hero is man.

This bloodless abstraction may facilitate theorising, but it has terrible consequences. The entire theory moves on the supposition that a person is a means to a social end, an 'expendable unit' in a super-Plan, of infinitely less consequence than the end for which he is used. And when the quiddities and contrarities of human nature conflict with the smooth working of a logically reasonable plan, then a man must be trimmed and moulded to the narrowness of the theory, or scrapped.

In the second place, a whole host of problems arises in connexion with the development and function of mind. The relationship of a remembering, selecting, assessing mind to physical laws is one thing ; but the relationship of a secondary and

derived mind, itself conditioned by social existence, to social laws is quite another thing. There is no way for mind to get out, as it were, to understand that with which it is completely homogeneous. The celebrated letter of Engels to Joseph Bloch, which is held by Marxists to solve the problem, castigates the writers of 'Marxist balderdash' and says plainly that non-economic elements often preponderate in determining the form of the historic struggle; but also says, equally plainly, that in the long run the economic process asserts itself as necessary. So long as we must stay on the ground of the Marxist presuppositions, the problem is insoluble. It is, in fact, directly linked with the crucial difficulty of every materialist philosophy: how can mind so develop from non-mind as to be congruous with it and yet distinct from it? If the glorious destiny of man depends upon his guidance of the dialectical process, there is no ground in the dialectic for the assumption that he can guide it. If he can guide his own destiny, the theory of the dialectic is so transformed as to be irrelevant.

But the real weakness of the Marxist doctrine lies in its inadequacy. It is a brilliant, ingenious, and finally ineffective attempt to find, on the model of eighteenth century rationalism, a 'single solution' to the problem of man. The Christian could quite legitimately accept the whole economic analysis involved in the Labour Theory of Value—though he would have to be a poor economist to do so. (And even so, it should be said that, taking it as a general proposition that labour is in fact exploited in society, it is undeniably true. The

complications arise when one fact of society is compelled to carry a greater load of theory than it can bear.) He can accept as true the statement that man is a material being who has to eat, that no man liveth to himself, and that social changes are qualitative as well as quantitative. But what he cannot accept is that this is the *whole truth* about man. The facts on which Marx built are true enough, but he only used half the facts. Christianity, the most materialist of all religions, accepts the fact that man in social relatedness, must ask: 'Give us this day our daily bread.' But it accepts also the fact that 'man doth not live by bread alone.'

So long as the Marxist thinks only in terms of daily bread and material necessity he will continue to under-estimate or deny the power and reality of sin. He will retain his Platonic trust in the wisdom of the expert craftsmen of politics. Which means that if the Christian analysis is sound, if man is not so much a creature frustrated only by an imperfect social environment but is primarily a rebellious child of God, then the Marxist is doomed to continual disappointment.

But even if this were not so, even if the unimaginable joys of the perfect human society were one day to be all realized by some far-distant generation, what is there in that attractive to the Marxist? The good time to come is of no significance to a mortal, perishable, concrete, actual body of matter in motion. The Christian hope, set on the ground of Christian doctrine, is reasonable. The Marxist hope, set on the ground of Marxist doctrine, is not.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Tito.

BY THE REVEREND CHARLES M. HEPBURN, B.D.,
CRIEFF.

'For I also am a man set under authority, having under me soldiers, and I say unto one, Go, and he goeth; and to another, Come, and he cometh; and to my servant, Do this, and he doeth it.'—Lk 7⁸.

You have all heard, I suppose, of Yugoslavia. It's a big word, but it means 'the land of the South Slavs,' a little country in South-East Europe. The chief man of it is Marshal Tito. But his proper name is Josip Broz and Tito is just a nickname, though it is the one he uses for preference. This is how it happened. He was a good organizer

and had an underground or guerilla army. He would send for people, 'partisans' was the name they used, and instruct them what to do.

'You,' he would say, 'will do this, and you that.' Only in his own tongue what he said was this:

'Ti, to; ti, to.'

Or as we might say:

'Thou, this; thee, that.'

He was always saying it. He said it so often the name stuck to him. That is why he is Marshal Tito now.

Very strangely now St. Luke tells us about another man like that. He was a centurion, an officer who had charge over a hundred soldiers. He was also much admired by the Jews, for he had built a synagogue for them. Once then, the

story says, this centurion wanted Jesus to come and heal one of his servants who was sick. And then, thinking that was troubling Jesus a bit too much, he sent another message saying, 'Just say the word and my servant will be healed.'

After that, he added this :

'I am accustomed to that myself. I say to a soldier, Go, and he goes ; or Come, and he comes ; or Do this, and he does it.'

A very wonderful sort of obedience, isn't it, soldierly obedience ; but I believe there is one finer, the sort Jesus wants and the sort Jesus gets. Once, when walking by the Sea of Galilee, He saw two fishermen, Andrew and Simon, busy fishing.

'Come ye after me,' He said, 'and I will make you fishers of men.'

And what happened ?

'And straightway,' it says, 'they forsook their nets, and followed him.'

Immediate obedience. And, what is far more, willing obedience. Andrew and Simon Peter obeyed because they wanted to obey.

Andrew and Peter of Galilee,
James, whose father was Zebedee,
And John his brother, four fisher folk ;
But, Oh, how swiftly when Jesus spoke,
Just two small words from those blessed lips,
They left their nets and their little ships.

Such is, of course, then the sort of obedience Jesus Christ wants also of us. There are some people who obey Marshal Tito, when they might prefer not to. Maybe, too, there were some soldiers who obeyed the commands of the centurion unwillingly. Such obedience would never satisfy Jesus. So let us seek to obey Him with all our hearts because we wish to and because we love Him.

With a child's glad heart of love
At Thy bidding may I move,
Prompt to serve and follow Thee,
Loving Him who first loved me.

Make Use of the Resistance.

BY THE REVEREND V. J. ABERNETHY, B.D.,
BERWICK-ON-TWEED.

'God hath made that same Jesus, whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ.'—Ac 2³⁶.

We had a visit to our town recently of the R.A.F. Travelling Van Exhibition 'Man takes Wings.' There were actually two vans—one showing photographs to indicate the development of flying from the days of Bleriot and the Wright brothers down to modern times. There were also models

which worked when the buttons were pressed, models designed to show the effect of air pressure on the wings of a plane and the effect of the propeller driving back the air and so pushing forward the plane. The other van contained a full-sized jet-propulsion engine. The guide explained how the air entered at the bonnet of the engine, passed through air-compressors, and eventually reached the turbine to set it in motion. If I understood him aright, the air through which the plane is driving its way is used to generate the power which helps the plane along.

It is a fascinating idea, and long ago intrigued me concerning the driving of ships. There is tremendous power in water. What a useful and economical thing it would be if a ship could take unto herself the water through which she is ploughing her way, and make that water drive her along ! I believe there have been experiments made to try out such a device, but I don't know that they have proved successful. What a grand idea. To use the resistance to drive the ship along !

But this idea is not confined to planes and ships. It can be applied to conduct and daily life. We can use the powers that resist to help us along. Let us take an example. Supposing you are the unfortunate possessor of a bad temper. No one would consider that an asset. At times you lose your temper, act foolishly, and then feel ashamed of yourself. No one would deny that a bad temper resists your moving forward along the road of life. But there is one thing about temper which is in your favour ; it shows that you have spirit. Why not take it in hand, and use your energy and passion in your work so that you have none to expend over some trivial thing such as not being allowed out to play, or to go to the pictures, or to have some one in. Make use of the Resister. Enlist him on your side, and you will travel much better.

Or take an examination. Most boys and girls will admit that a forthcoming exam. is a Resister to life's peace and well-being. Well, what about treating an exam. in the same way as the jet-propelled plane treats the air that resists it ? Get it on your side ; make use of it to help you along. Instead of making heavy weather of an exam., get down to it. Study hard, try to concentrate, try to become interested. And do you know what will happen ? You'll get through your exam., and you will find that the studies have opened up new opportunities for you in life. The knowledge derived will stand you in good stead, and that which you had looked upon as a Resister will lead you on to greater service and prospects.

How the life of Helen Keller reveals this attitude. Helen was an American girl who at a very early age became blind and deaf and dumb.

What resistance to life's well-being! But think how Helen made use of the Resisters. She learnt letters, words and ideas, and then became a great reader. You see, there was nothing to distract her from reading. She could see no boys and girls playing outside who might make her want to go out and play; neither could she hear them. Then there was no Wireless Programme that she might want to listen to, and so be distracted from her book. And so Helen made use of her handicaps, concentrated on her reading, and thus acquired sufficient knowledge to give her a University degree and enabled her to become a well-known lecturer. Making use of the resistance.

And so it was with Jesus. There were Resisters in His life. Men who resented what He said and did. So they listened to Him to try and trap Him. At last, they thought they had succeeded. They had Him seized, tried, and crucified. It seemed as if the Resisters had mastered Him at last. But not at all! They crucified Him, and by that Crucifixion, Jesus seems to have brought the strength of His Resisters on His side. By facing the Cross in the manner in which He did, Jesus seems to have taken all the venom and sting out of their attack, and to have become the Saviour of the World. He takes the hatred of men and makes it reveal the love of God. He makes use of the resistance to glorify God.

So we must admit that there is a moral as well as a scientific truth in this idea, and we do well to apply it to the sphere of conduct as well as to aeronautics.

The Dedication of the Offering.

Almighty God, we pray Thee
that these our offerings may be used
for the glory of Thy name,
in the proclamation of the gospel,
and the confirmation of Thy Church,
and the coming of Thy Kingdom,
through Jesus Christ, our Lord,
Amen.

or

Most gracious God, as we bring our gifts to Thee
do Thou pardon and take away
all our lukewarmness in Thy service.

Mercifully deal with us,
not according to the poverty of our devotion,
but according to the riches of Thy grace
in Jesus Christ, our Lord, Amen.

or

O God without whose favour nothing profits,
let Thy blessing go with these gifts
that we offer for Thy work;
and let it remain in our hearts,
making us richer, not poorer, for what we give to Thee,
for Christ's sake, Amen.

or

O Thou who lovest a cheerful giver,
teach us by Thy Spirit
to be thoughtful and prayerful in our giving,
Grant us the joy of the generous heart,
and the spirit of love and self-sacrifice
that was in Jesus Christ our Lord, Amen.

or

Accept O Lord we pray Thee this offering we make.
Cause it to be used to the glory of Thy name
in the work of Thy Kingdom.
And teach us how to bring,
not only gifts, but our whole lives, to Thy service,
through Jesus Christ, our Lord,
Amen.

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Good Shepherd of the Post-Resurrection Days.

BY THE REVEREND G. LACEY MAY, M.A.,
WINCHESTER.

'All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee.'—Mk 14²⁷.

1. Here, according to His wont, the Saviour links the foretelling of His Passion with the promise of the Resurrection. In these particular words He does more; He links up His Resurrection with *His post-resurrection work as the Good Shepherd*.

We are inclined to limit our Lord's pastorate to the days of His ministry. We picture Him in those three years healing the sick, feeding the hungry, teaching the ignorant, comforting the sorrowful, instructing the enquirer, building up the inner life of the Twelve, and laying sure foundations for the Church-to-be.

But in this saying of His the thought of Him as Good Shepherd is carried on to a further stage—into *His post-resurrection days*. The whole of those forty days are characteristically stamped with His tender shepherding of His flock.

2. During these forty days the Risen Lord was neither easily nor at once recognized by His friends. Thrice this happened on Easter Day. Mary Magdalene at the tomb 'thought him to be the gardener'; the disciples on the Emmaus road walked and talked with Him quite a long time before they discovered who He was. When that same evening He appeared to the Ten, they were struck with fear. Even some days later, when He met them in Galilee, whilst they worshipped, 'some doubted.' The return of a human from the dead brings always an element of terror or apprehension; and it was so in the case of our Lord.

But in each instance of His appearing this feeling of uncertainty in His followers' minds passed as they gradually recognised Him as their Master and Friend. Through startling circumstance and changed appearance something in Him persisted—some quality or characteristic—which reassured their troubled spirits.

One characteristic which persisted—so unchanged as to identify Him surely as the Master—was that individual *pastoral care* which they had all known so well during the days of His ministry. Notice again how our Lord had linked up the two ideas—'I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered. But after that I am risen, I will go before you into Galilee'—*as a shepherd leads his flock.*

3. This recognition through what we may call our Lord's pastoral personality becomes very impressive if we look in detail at His post-resurrection appearances. Always to His wondering friends that pastoral tenderness stood out, and it is duly recorded by each of the Four Evangelists.

Consider the appearances *in this light*. Mary Magdalene, blinded by tears or misled by physical change in Him, thought Him to be the gardener; but her misconception was instantly dispelled by the tenderness of His familiar voice.

On the Emmaus road He is unrecognized until at the evening meal some inflection of voice, some familiar gesture, as He presided at the table, made Him known to the two friends as the same Jesus who in pastoral love had broken bread for the multitudes in the desert and for the Twelve in the Upper Room. He now became 'known to them' in a pastoral act for the feeding of friends—'in the breaking of bread.'

The same evening, in the Upper Room, the fear cast by His appearance upon the Apostles vanished (as in the case of Mary Magdalene) at the sound of the familiar voice; and all possible doubt was dispelled when He showed them the marks of suffering with which He had been 'wounded in the house of His friends.'

Later, in Galilee, Peter's grief for his faithlessness was salved when the Good Shepherd gave him a pastoral charge with pastoral words—'Feed my lambs. . . . Feed my sheep.' To the same apostle, it seems, our Lord must have confided the story of His pastorate in the waiting world before He rose from the dead: for it is Peter alone among New Testament writers who tells us 'he went and preached unto the spirits in prison, which aforetime were disobedient, when the longsuffering of God waited in the days of Noah.'

Lastly, as climax to all His teaching of the great forty days, comes the pastoral charge—'Go . . . and teach all nations.'

From all this we see why the conception of Christ as the Good Shepherd had special appeal for those who suffered persecution for His sake in the early decades of the Church. Had not He Himself emphasized it by every means in His power? It was natural for Peter some years later to dwell lovingly upon the Lord as 'the chief Shepherd,'—'tend the flock of God which is among you . . . And when the chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away'—and to write to Christian converts: 'Ye were going astray like sheep; but are now returned unto the Shepherd and Bishop of your souls.' And what more natural name for the Master could the author of Hebrews give than 'the great shepherd of the sheep?'

4. This Christian conception of Christ as the Good Shepherd did not derive solely from His choice of that title or from the events of the great forty days. It was made a living reality to primitive Christians *by their personal experiences*. Through suffering, persecution, missionary hardships, imprisonment, and death, they found that their Good Shepherd's present care never failed them.

'Stone walls do not a prison make,' sang an imprisoned Cavalier. No prison wall, no tribulation, could exclude the loving Presence of the Good Shepherd, or the good cheer which He showered upon His suffering friends. Paul and Silas found Him in their prison-cell at Philippi; John in the daunting solitude of Patmos.

Their experience is ours to-day. If we recall our own life's course from its beginnings, we can recognize (how clearly!) the Good Shepherd's personal care. He was shepherding us in our Christening, in the religious teaching of our parents and school teachers, in our Confirmation and many Communion, in the Church's faithful instructions, in frequent silent renewals of consolation, strength and guidance; and, indeed, in a thousand events and influences not normally thought of as religious.

All this, in spite of the fact that in blindness we have continually attributed these and other blessings not to the Good Shepherd, but to this or that 'fortunate chance!'

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Truth that Ends our Falseness.

By THE REVEREND VINCENT ROSS, B.D., GLASGOW.

'I am the . . . truth.'—Jn 14⁶.

'Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'—Jn 8³².

Philosophers exist to incite men to explore beyond appearance to reality and truth. For

Christians, truth is personal and the quest ends in Jesus, who audaciously and startlingly claims to be Himself the Truth.

Clearly, this is the most arrant nonsense, or else it is a fact of most decisive importance. The modern preacher need spend little time arguing the demonstrable falseness of contemporary society. To-day the world is littered with the wreckage of broken promises and false pacts, programmes and philosophies. If then Christ be the Truth, it is to the Christian religion men must look to abolish this sorry state of affairs.

Can, then, this claim be upheld? Ponder the story of twenty Christian centuries and you will discover it to be incontestably authenticated in the lives of a multitude of ordinary folk and in the fashioning of a progressive society. The encounter with Jesus reveals the truth which sets men free to realize the life and society that God intends.

Inscribed on the tombstone of a missionary, buried in India because she refused to retire and cease preaching Christ to its teeming population, are the words of this text and a comment which reads: 'Ellen Arnold walked that Way; taught that Truth; lived that Life.'

I am prepared without hesitation to claim that, in such a life, falseness is being exterminated.

In three ways, however many more, Christ sets us free from error.

1. *He ends the falseness of our thinking.* Jesus is relevant, because nothing is more sure about us moderns than our lost grip upon those things always and finally true and real. In his book, *Straight and Crooked Thinking*, Thouless poses the problem. Jesus replies. When we think about things, God, man, the world, life, as Jesus does—that is straight thinking. When we think otherwise—that is crooked thinking. It is necessary to-day to assert with clarity and boldness that the Christian faith is inextricably, indissolubly bound up with truth; that the *obiter dicta* of Jesus are not just one more opinion but the definitive truth about the nature of things.

In this era of confused thinking, in which the acids of popular philosophy have menacingly corroded our faith in absolute standards against which there is no appeal, it is broadminded and sophisticated to believe that one opinion is quite as good as another and mine equally as good as yours or even that of Jesus. Truth has been reduced to mere human speculation and we fix standards with an eye to our own interests. Little wonder, therefore, it is, that many moderns dismiss Christianity as a pretty tale, a delightful fantasy, an inspiring legend, but at the best no more than unrealistic, wishful thinking—spoofing on the grand and elaborate scale. Jesus is not

the Truth; He is a hypothesis. Not so have Christians learned the Faith. In Christ we have something given, something objective, a fact that corresponds with reality.

In the house of a young woman there reposed on the pantry shelf a tea caddy on which was a picture of Gibraltar at which she gazed day after day. Some years ago the girl found herself aboard a P. and O. liner bound for Egypt and one morning to her intense pleasure and surprise when she awakened and glanced through the port-hole, there was Gibraltar, exactly as it was painted on the caddy. 'There,' she said, 'almost within a toss of a ship's biscuit was Gibraltar Rock, just as I had seen it pictured scores of times; but heavens it was *real*! It has been real like that all the time.'

In so far as the caddy corresponded with the Rock of Gibraltar it was exhibiting the truth. Like Gibraltar Rock we Christians have an objective, given Fact, no invention of speculative reasoning, in the historic Jesus of Galilee and in the Person of the Living Christ; and in Jesus is reality. Thus in so far as our minds think the thoughts of Jesus and picture His accurately, our thinking is true to the nature of things as they finally are.

Indeed, if you are looking for the word 'ideal' or 'idealism' you will scan the pages of the Testament in vain. Not so does it speak. Its words are 'reality' and 'truth.' Christianity deals, not with what 'ought' to be but with that which actually 'is.' God *is*; Christ *is* His revealer; man *is* an immortal son; love *is* the basic law of life. And so on. In touch with Jesus you encounter reality.

I beg you to believe that I am not claiming an infallible Church. History exposes all such pretension. What Christ is; what Christ teaches; what Christ does—that is truth, both now and beyond this sphere of time and history. Thus Jesus sets men free from falsehood and error.

2. *Jesus sets men free from false roads to the good they are seeking.* Jesus claims to be the true Way and nothing can be more surely said of this modern generation than that we have lost our way.

We are like the oft-told story of the Englishman in Ireland, who asked the way to Roscommon. 'Is it Roscommon you want to go to?' queried the Irishman. 'It is,' said the Englishman, 'that's why I asked the way.' 'Well,' replied the Irishman, 'if I wanted to go to Roscommon I wouldn't be starting from here.'

We are starting from here and we know where we are—living in a rather uncomfortable, perilous economy which is liable to explode at any moment and blast us and our achievements to smithereens.

We are clear, too, about our destination—a society in which men find peace, prosperity, and a meed of happiness. Our trouble is that we don't know the way. Only yesterday our politicians were attempting to outline 'The Right Road for Britain.' Frankly, have any of our parties either the insight or the courage to state the simple truth of the matter? The order of the day still seems to be muddling ourselves into some new muddle or mess.

Christ alone can set us on the right road. Between the society where we are and the community where we desire to be a great gulf is fixed and only one bridge exists—Christ and His way and spirit and power.

Does that appear to you to be just what you might expect the Church to say, the parson's patter and clichés, another advertising stunt to create belief in those things which the Church has to offer?

Look at it, then, from this angle. Range over the whole hideous extent of chaos and confusion, the tangle and rupture in domestic and social relations. I am not prepared to say that commitment to Christ will automatically solve all the burning issues of the day. That is being stupidly pious. We shall still need the best brains, skilful planning, and costly experiment. But I am prepared to say that, if you will analyse any major modern malady, at the heart of it you will find some blatant egoistic flouting of the things for which Jesus stands. War, totalitarianism, class hatred, unemployment, grinding poverty, the modern rackets—behind all, and the cause of them, is an obstinate rebellion against the word and will of Jesus. The preference for ruthless self-assertion before God.

Jesus is the real way. As in the Testament on the tempestuous Galilean Lake, when Jesus came aboard the ship, then the disciples were able to reach the other side, the desired haven. Not before. Therein lies a parable for us modern folk. Only with the Faith will we achieve the good Community without which we are perishing.

3. *It is the evangel of Jesus that sets men free from artificiality in our living.* Here, again, Jesus is the Truth about life, and nothing could be more true about millions of us than that our existence is unreal, artificial and hollow.

This generation has chosen to live without God and His Church and what value must we place upon their life? In all justice, many of them have exhibited fine qualities and decent actions. But by and large, Eliot, one of their most brilliant men of letters, calls them 'The Hollow Men'—

Shape without form, shade without colour,
Paralysed force, gesture without motion.

As one character in a novel says, 'I would like to take life by the throat and choke something out of it.'

Not a pretty picture, that!

Religion, said Arnold in a famous definition, is that power not ourselves that makes for righteousness. Christianity is the power that makes for life with a tang and flavour.

It is incontestably true that at this very hour there are tens of thousands of men and women who would quite openly admit that life minus Christ would be mere shadow and shell. Such persons are part of the fact of Christ in the modern world, and in them Jesus steps out of the past to become the Great Contemporary and bestow upon us the life wherein true joys are to be found. 'I've had a king's life,' confessed Rutherford, the Scottish saint, 'with Christ.'

'I see Him. I see Him,' cried Pascal, more than three centuries ago, to a great congregation in Paris. 'I see Him in all His splendour . . . and lo! He is on His way to God. But now—I see Him turn, and now I see Him smile and cry: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. O, France, follow Me, and win the Crown."'

Even so Christ sets us gloriously free from the tyranny of the false.

Thou art the Truth.

Questions the ages break against in vain,
Confront the Spirit in its untried youth.
It starves while sifting poison from the grain.
Thou art the Truth.

Thou art the Life.

All life without Thee paths that end in death,
All life without Thee with death's harvest rife,
All truth dry bones disjoined and void of breath.
Thou art the Life.

ROGATION SUNDAY

Work.

BY THE REVEREND J. ADAMSON FINLAY, M.A.,
GLASGOW.

'Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening.'—Ps 104²⁸.

A noted European geologist was once offered a large sum of money to go on a lecturing tour in America. It was a tempting offer, but he turned it down with the remark, 'I have no time to make money.' In so saying, he was not merely making an epigram but was revealing his attitude to life, in which his work had first place. Work for him was not a money-making device but a call, a vocation, a destiny.

Is it not time in this generation that work was

viewed with a less jaundiced eye than has been the case for some time, and that it was seen for what it is, not a nuisance or a curse, not something to have as little contact with as possible, but an obligation laid upon man by God in His wisdom and love. 'Man goeth forth unto his work and to his labour until the evening.' Such is God's decree: to go forth to work in the dew of youth, to give to it the prime of one's strength, and to continue in it till the shadows lengthen. Then, having worked well, one may rest well; for the quality of rest at a day's end, or a year's end, a life's end, is determined in large measure by one's preceding attitude to work. 'People who never do any work,' observes Viscount Samuel, 'never have any holidays.'

1. Work is an acid test of character. Not only by our works in the Biblical sense, but by our work shall we be known. Work brings to the surface what is in a person; his right views or his wrong views, his energy or his sloth, the wholeness of his personality or its disunity, his essential integrity or the want of it. John Ruskin has a searing sentence about work and workers which if somewhat strong may hold a needed warning. 'A man,' he says, 'who accepts Adam Smith's statement that a workman is kept honest by fear of losing his employment is in an entirely damned state of soul.' One could do untold damage to one's personality through a rootedly dishonest attitude to work.

When God sent His Son to this earth it was in the first instance to work for many years at a carpenter's bench; and that bench became a kind of judgment seat for all workers. There work was done as work should be done, with the joyous fidelity of the whole heart. To that bench therefore we all come up for judgment. Not that He who worked there frowned upon men or disparaged their work. He just did His own work according to the full measure of His manhood, and the spirit He brought to His bench separates men, silently and relentlessly, into those who are true workers and those who are not. No more fundamental question can be asked about any man than: How does he work?

2. Besides being a test of character, work is also a producer of character. Let a man or a woman be consistently zealous and faithful in their work through the years, no matter what the task, in high place or low, and most certainly their personality will take on a certain indefinable dignity; and, what is more, though they may not articulate it to themselves, they will be conscious of a deep-down rightness as of one matched with his lot.

As they work, character will grow. The difficulties and obstacles incidental to the steady

performance of duty, the strain at times, the wearing monotony at other times, the inevitable discouragements: such things form the raw material out of which strength and depth of character can be formed. And in the upshot, character and not gear is the real reward of labour. As Ian Maclaren's Dr. Maclure put it: 'Wark comes first, an' fechtin' awa wi' oor cauld land, an' wringin' eneuch oot o't tae pay for rent and livin' pits smeddum (spirit) into a man.'

Work does produce character, but to be the right kind of character it must be the right kind of work. Bad work inevitably issues in deterioration of character; just as good work, in which a man invests 'the great original capital of head and heart and hand,' results in the wealth which sound character is.

3. Rightly viewed, work is one of God's best blessings to His children. How great, for example, is the protective value of work. When a person is busy with his toil he is saved from the shafts of many a temptation to which the idle or indolent person is laid open and often falls a prey. Useful occupation saves from boredom, which is a prolific breeding ground of wrongdoing, and puts in the place of boredom a healthful contentment. Work, moreover, is a safeguard against various forms of ill-health, since it supplies the personality with a purpose which tends to harmonize and unify its powers and keep it healthy. 'To be physically fit,' said Lord Horder, 'a purpose or a passion is absolutely essential in most of us.'

The value and blessing of work is many-sided; and in the long experience of man it has been found to come as a veritable angel of light in dark days of sorrow. When nothing can relieve the awful gnawing anguish of grief, when human words are all but vain, when everything seems vain, then work will help a little, and by and by will help much.

As for that pleasure and satisfaction in life which every normal heart craves, where is it to be found more surely and more healthfully than in the work to which a person diligently sets his hand? Sir Walter Scott bore testimony to this when toward the close of his life he said to his son-in-law: 'I have had as much happiness in my life as most people, and I must not complain now.' When Lockhart replied that whatever had been his share of happiness, no man could have laboured better for it, Sir Walter answered: 'I consider the capacity to labour as part of the happiness I have enjoyed.'

Work is indeed an inestimable blessing, a source of health, a safeguard against temptation, an anodyne in sorrow, and a perennial spring of as fair a measure of satisfaction as this world affords.

One of the needs of our day is that we should take a new look at work, repent of our ways, and believe in the high intention of God in giving us work to do and skill and strength to do it. The person who brings to his work less than his best cheats nobody so greatly as he cheats himself; and many, it is to be feared, are practising this cheaterly in this bemuddled age. Let us not be of their number. Let us to our work with heart and mind and soul, for this is the will of our Father in heaven for us. Man goeth forth to his work and to his labour until the evening. And at evening time it shall be light.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

The Ascended Lord.

BY THE REVEREND ARTHUR H. KIRKBY, M.A., B.D.,
LEICESTER.

'He led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.'—Lk 24^{50t}.

Observing the festivals of the Christian year is like a tour round a great cathedral. The wonders and glories of the whole building are viewed from as many angles as possible, so that every aspect of its beauty may be appreciated. Special seasons of the Christian year are as special viewpoints from which we survey the massive beauty and glory of the Christian gospel.

A point of view from which the faith is too rarely regarded is the Festival of the Ascension. Some kind of formal belief is given to the doctrines emphasized at the season. Lips recite the phrase of the Apostle's Creed, 'He ascended into heaven,' but hearts are not warmed by the thought behind the words. Yet the fact of the Ascension is most plainly taught in the New Testament.

The text gives an account of the simple beginnings of the whole belief. Jesus, the Risen Lord, was with His disciples at Bethany, and He blessed them. As He blessed them 'he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven.' The critical mind begins to ask questions as the words are read. Is heaven to be located in a perpendicular direction from that point in Bethany? Such a question of celestial geography, however, misses the point. It is a great spiritual truth that is conveyed by the story.

There are three episodes in the life of our Lord that give us the clue to an understanding of the meaning of the Ascension. The first episode is that in which He is the localized Incarnate Lord. He is limited in the same way that we are all limited. He cannot be in two places at once. If

He is in Nazareth, He cannot be in Capernaum; if He is in Jericho, He cannot be in Jerusalem. He is in one place at one time.

The human side of this we appreciate. From our earliest days we learn to adapt ourselves to this condition of our existence, that we cannot be in two places at the same time. Dr. Boreham in one of his essays touches on this in a whimsical fashion. He says that our bodies are at once great handicaps and great blessings. If, for example, we want to do some mischief we must take our bodies with us to do it, and they are a handicap. Again, if we want to do a good turn to somebody, the act is done by our bodies, and the person who benefits knows who the kind friend is. This limiting condition of our existence is therefore an element in the formation of character.

While we may appreciate the human side, the Divine side in relation to our Lord is a great mystery. We believe that He is the only-begotten of the Father sharing in the nature of the Godhead from eternity to eternity. Paul, writing to the Church at Philippi, speaks of the Son 'being in the form of God,' and One who did not count it some honour to be snatched at to be regarded on an equality with God. Yet He who shared with the Father the Divine attributes of omniscience, and omnipotence, and omnipresence humbled Himself, and accepted the cramping conditions of a human life. He had to learn; He knew weakness and frustration; He was in one place only at one time. We meet here the mystery of grace.

The second episode is that which follows the Resurrection. Surprisingly, unexpectedly, He appears among His disciples. Miss Dorothy Sayers, in *The Man Born to be King*, makes a dramatic incident of the occasion recorded in the Fourth Gospel when Thomas is unwilling to believe what the other disciples say about Jesus being alive. He states quite plainly that unless he can see for himself the print of the nails he will not believe. While he makes his firm asseveration Jesus appears in the midst, and the other disciples have to quiet his hasty words, letting him know that the Master is present.

The Resurrection appearances of our Lord are not subject to the ordinary conditions of human appearances. He determines when they shall be, where they shall be, and when they shall end. At times He makes Himself known to only one, to Cephas. On another occasion it may be to several, as to the Eleven. Paul tells us that there was a time when He appeared to more than five hundred at one time. All these varied appearances were part of His teaching His disciples to know that He was always near.

The third episode is that which is associated

with His Ascension. This is not His disappearance from the world, but the assurance that He is everywhere in the world, for every one. The words of George MacDonald have often been quoted in this connexion. The Ascension of our Lord means His going from the here into the everywhere. He is not the absent One because He has ascended to the Father; on the contrary, He is the everlastingly present One. He assumes again those Divine attributes which He graciously laid aside for man's sake.

It is our failure to believe this great doctrine of the Ascended Lord that impoverishes so much of our Christian worship and Christian living. How uplifting an experience to commence the act of worship knowing that He is present. It is no time of sweet remembrance of a beautiful but past life. It is a time of communion with One who is alive, present with His people. What He was in time, He is for ever in eternity, the Saviour who seeks and saves the lost.

How easily we reckon the success of an act of worship or a meeting at a Church by the number

of people attending. The success depends more upon the facility in counting the angelic hosts that are present. An old faithful deacon once told his minister that 'all the Shining Ones were present' at the early morning Prayer Meeting. He who is the Ascended Lord is present to meet His own when they gather to worship.

Perhaps the real work of the Church would be taken much more seriously if we remembered the significance of this season of the Christian year. In remembering Him and the extension of His Kingdom we should not have time for entertaining ourselves with footling secularities. The wonder of His love would give a new dynamic to all our plans, and His greater glory would become the main purpose of all our activities.

'He was parted from them,' Luke writes, but it was a parting in one form only. For the Ascended Lord made Himself known to them in many other forms by His Spirit. And not to them only. Believers of every place and every time know the certainty and the power of His love.

The Gospel of Life.

BY THE REVEREND THOMAS M. DONN, M.A., DUTHIL, INVERNESS-SHIRE.

A SEMANTICALLY correct English version of the Bible has been a desideratum for a long time, and if the new translation, which is being prepared, meets this need it will render a great service to the task of setting forth the true doctrines of Christ and the gospel. Here I seek to indicate briefly how incorrect renderings in the existing English versions continue to obscure and to some extent to falsify these doctrines of which I select two only—Reconciliation and Forgiveness. In translating the Greek New Testament, the sole consideration ought to be the exact reproduction of the meaning of the text and, where that is not possible without paraphrase, there ought to be notes giving the exact meaning or differing views as to that meaning, for the benefit of those who cannot consult the Greek text for themselves or the work of the most eminent New Testament exegetes.

RECONCILIATION.

It is well known that the *usus loquendi* of the Greek New Testament invariably represents God or Christ as reconciling man to Himself and never Christ as reconciling God to man. In the sole instance where reconciliation between men is

mentioned (Mt 5²⁴) the verb used is not *καταλλάσσειν* but *διαλλάσσειν*. The continued use by theologians and others of the word 'atonement' (found only in E.V. 1611 at Ro 5¹¹) is much to be regretted as it has now lost its original Shakespearean meaning which is identical with reconciliation and in any case corresponds to the same Greek word elsewhere so rendered. Atonement now suggests the ideas of expiation, appeasement, piacular sacrifice, substitution, and satisfaction, which are wholly alien to the true doctrine of reconciliation. For the same reason the retention by Moffatt and Weymouth of the term 'propitiation' is unfortunate because, though its Greek equivalent is used in LXX as the only term available to represent the Hebrew terms *kipper* (make reconciliation) and *salah* (pardon or forgive) its pagan connotation was excluded from the Old Testament by taking the word sin as its object. As it is impossible in English to speak of 'propitiating sin' we find other renderings.

So far then as the terminology of the Greek New Testament is concerned all pagan notions are utterly excluded, and it is the bounden duty of all translators to avoid suggesting them in their renderings and not to use archaic words now

differently understood. But at present it is only with some difficulty and with the guidance given from the pulpit and from books that the English reader can see clearly that the true doctrine of reconciliation in the New Testament differs greatly from the many perversions of it which abound and which antagonize many morally intelligent people. That doctrine shows the gospel to be the Gospel of Life from the spiritual viewpoint and the Gospel of Righteousness from the moral viewpoint and in that inward sense so emphatic in the teaching of Jesus Himself.

Jesus Christ was not merely a teacher of truth and life: He was the Truth and the Life and came to give life to men. The unique nature and origin of His person, His words, His works, His own submission of His will of the flesh to the will of the Father in all things, culminating in His voluntary death—all these individually and collectively had as their aim the imparting of life to believers thereby enabling them to live by faith (which is something much more than 'belief' or the secular meaning of the word 'faith'). Salvation by *θρησκεία* ('religion'), by 'works' or 'a man's own righteousness,' and by a profession of 'orthodoxy' combined with outward respectability finds no countenance in the New Testament. Had Jesus not challenged and rejected the sufficiency of these things the anger, opposition, and cruelty of His enemies would have been inexplicable.

Reconciliation takes place only when life is received from Christ. But just as food cannot possibly revive a body already dead, so the Word, unless it were also the Word of Life, could not give life to man. But the Spirit, so to speak, gives the Word power over those who are truly seeking reconciliation with God and hence man is said to be *born* not only of water (the symbol of the Word) but also of the Spirit (Jn 3⁵).

But it is obvious that in the New Testament a very special significance for reconciliation is given to the death of Jesus. Here again the common mistranslations in the English versions have obscured the true doctrine, introduced alien ideas and assisted in perverting its meaning.

Now, surprising as the statement appears to be *prima facie*, it is an exegetical fact that Jesus Himself in no recorded saying ever connects the forgiveness of sins with His death. Since, as Calvin aptly remarks, 'He must be heard before all His apostles in discoursing of His office' (*Inst.* II. xii. 4), this fact should have led interpreters to show great caution in considering the Apostolic doctrine of reconciliation. Had they always done so they would have discovered that that doctrine exactly corresponds with the teaching of Jesus concerning His death. The words 'for the remis-

sion of sins' (Mt 26²⁸) are very generally considered to be a gloss on the text, but in any case (*pace* Weymouth, etc.), 'remission' means far more than 'forgiveness.' Despite the scribes' charge of blasphemy and their challenge 'Who can forgive sins but God only?' Jesus forgave sins and claimed the right and authority to do so—which He authenticated by miracle and not by simply declaring in answer to His critics 'I am God as well as man.' He forgave sins long before He died nor does He ever suggest that such forgiveness was, so to speak, in anticipation of, or conditional upon, His death. The totality of His life and death in the flesh had reconciling purpose and efficacy: His words and His flesh were very specially identified in the fulfilment of that purpose. The Early Church grasped this salient fact, and hence was especially careful to resist above all things the plausible heresy of Doketism which claimed to stand on a higher spiritual level and to take a more exalted view of Jesus by eliminating the reality of His manhood and reducing it to mere appearance. This heresy has taken some very subtle forms in the history of the Church which I have not space here to mention. The death of Jesus must not be isolated from the rest of His saving activity: it was the culminating expression of His previous and constant 'death unto sin.' When He said 'Not my will (*i.e.* the will of the flesh) but thine be done' He made the supreme declaration of His faith that God would by His death 'draw all men unto him' and so effect their reconciliation.

FORGIVENESS.

We have seen that Jesus came not to reconcile God to men but men to God. His hearers all knew from the Old Testament that God had promised always to forgive those who truly repented and turned from their sins and that He demanded no expiatory sacrifice, and that 'the sacrifices of God are a broken and contrite heart' and that what He required was that men should 'do justly, love mercy and walk humbly with Him.' Jesus came to 'fulfil the Law' by giving life to men. How then has it come about that it is widely believed that Jesus came merely to secure for men the forgiveness of sins by offering an expiatory sacrifice to cover all the sins of all men—past, present, and future? And that salvation consists in believing this and, of course, paying a respectful conformity to the creed, ritual, and material support of an 'infallible' Church which claims to be the sole medium of Divine grace and forgiveness? The answer briefly is, as Sohni has put it, that 'the natural man is a born Roman Catholic': if he is in the least concerned about the salvation of his

soul or, to speak more strictly, his safety and comfort in the hereafter, this creed is much more agreeable to him than the true doctrine of reconciliation.

The ambiguous use of the word forgiveness in the English New Testament becomes apparent when the Greek text is considered: there we find several different terms distinct in meaning: ἄφεσις χαριζόμενοι, ἐχαρίσατο are all translated 'forgiveness' or 'forgiven' while πάρεσιν is incorrectly rendered by 'remission' whereas it means 'passing over.' A detailed study of these terms as they occur in the Greek New Testament is most rewarding and illuminating but cannot be attempted here. Let it suffice to say that ἄφεσις means 'deliverance' or 'loosing' and when not used of sins it is invariably given its correct meaning in the New Testament. It is only where the loosing is from the *penalty* due to sin that it can be properly rendered by forgiveness in the sense of pardon. 'Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors'—where pardon is sought not deliverance from the *power* of sin itself, for no mere man (though he call himself a 'priest') can deliver another man from the power of sin: he can only pardon him who has sinned against him. But reconciliation means more than obtaining God's pardon; it means deliverance from the power of sin and by receiving life from Christ that process of deliverance commences and moves towards completion throughout our earthly life. Reconciliation takes priority, so to speak, over forgiveness as the central doctrine of the gospel; but the religious world by reversing the order and generally ignoring the necessity of reconciliation altogether by identifying forgiveness with reconciliation has gravely falsified the gospel. Nor is this error confined to Romanism; it has spread into the Reformed Churches too. For example, M'Leod Campbell's work, *The Nature of the Atonement* (significant title!), although possibly one of the most brilliant books on its subject, does not manage to keep clear of this tremendous fallacy which has gripped Christendom. But some of its successors are much more guilty in this respect. Consider, for example, the following words (italics mine): 'This truth is *the very heart* of the gospel; and if it were more clearly perceived and more firmly grasped, there would be less misgiving in awakened souls, less lack of "assurance." . . . It tells him that there is *no question* whether God will forgive him, *since his forgiveness is already a fait accompli*; and *the only question* is whether he will *appropriate* the mercy which is assured him and enter in at the door which stands open for him and every sinner of mankind . . . [and quoting M'Leod Campbell] "Believe in the forgiveness of your sins *because they are forgiven*." The Atonement

is not merely a declaration of God's willingness to forgive; it is an abiding evidence that *the* sin of the world has been *expiated* by God's Infinite Sacrifice, and forgiveness to the uttermost is assured to every sinner who will receive it. Forgiveness is ours already *de jure*, and it becomes ours *de facto* the moment we claim it' (David Smith, *The Atonement*, 214 f.).

Now forgiveness is *not* the very heart of the gospel: it is Christ—the *reconciling* Christ and Him crucified. It has always seemed strange to me why men should labour to convince sinners of the reality of 'the forgiveness of sins' (meaning pardon only) when the fact is that most of them have no difficulty at all in believing in that forgiveness: one will readily accept the *ipse dixit* and absolution of a priest as a passport to peace of conscience and heaven following on a verbal 'confession of sins' and the due performance of prescribed acts of penance; another considering 'religion' as so much nonsense will dope his soul and conscience with the light-hearted creed '*Le bon Dieu me pardonnera c'est son métier*.' Why? Because assured that Christ has expiated the sins of the whole world—past, present, and future. Certainly this false creed goes far to explain the present widespread and deplorable indifference of the many to the Church and to Christian standards of conduct. But the gospel is far more than a Gospel of Pardon or Forgiveness: it is the Gospel of Life, of Reconciliation by deliverance from the power and not only the guilt of sin. Where forgiveness or pardon alone is referred to in the Greek New Testament the word used is not ἄφεσις but, for example, πάρεσις (Ro 3²⁵). The solution of the so-called problem of the unpardonable sin (Mt 12³¹), consists in noting the simple fact that 'forgiveness' is a mistranslation of ἄφεσις. A great deal of the perplexity and undue sense of 'mystery' about the cardinal doctrines of Christ and the gospel would be cleared away by considering the actual meaning of the text of the Greek New Testament. We are told that Dean Church once confessed that the longer he lived the more his mind recoiled from the effort to understand how Christ bore our sins and how He obtained forgiveness: and Henry Drummond (in *The Ideal Life*, 182), quotes the following answer of a Scots Professor of Divinity when asked how long it took him to understand the doctrine of the Atonement which he was teaching—'*Eternity, Eternity*; and I shall not understand it then.' Surely this is not a very satisfactory frame of mind with which to attempt to preach the gospel of Christ and Him crucified: at least it must be very difficult to do so with boldness and confidence. It has been well said that 'a good textuary is always a good divine.'

Contributions and Comments.

ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς : Mark vii. 4.

'AND (anything) from the market-place, unless they sprinkle, they do not eat.' This is the rendering of Dr. Matthew Black in his recent volume on *The Aramaic Approach to the New Testament*.¹ The ordinary Versions supply the words *when they come*, following the reading of D and not a few old Latin versions. The testimony to βαπτίζονται seems overwhelming, but Nestle and W. H. are faithful to παντίζονται with B. It is certainly a 'pregnant construction,' as it stands, but must it mean 'when they come from the market?' If the implication is that the Pharisees did their own marketing—the clergy have had to do it in recent years in Jerusalem and in some parts of the West—the italicized words would be interesting, whether true or not! Why should not the 'pregnancy,' however, refer to something neuter 'coming from the market' rather than someone(s)? Mark has already stated that they washed their hands, as they used them for eating, while later there is the reference to 'washing up' the utensils of various kinds. The thing that does not seem mentioned is the food procured from the market. This is the meaning that Dr. Black gives to the passage. It is also the translation of Moffatt. The Diatesaron, too, seems to fall into line. There are other authorities as well. The *Editio Princeps* of the Gospels in Arabic reads: 'And what they buy from the market, they would not eat without washing.' In an Arabic MS. copied in 1734 and now in the Library of the Maronite Bishop of Aleppo the translation runs: 'And what they buy from the markets, except they wash it, they will not eat it.' In these two versions there are almost no verbal similarities, but the Semitic idiom seems to have been 'recognized and rightly rendered.' In the latter case, however, the wording does not stand alone; for the Arabic is identical both in Walton's *London Polyglot*, where the Arabic was revised partly by Pocock, who was British Chaplain in Aleppo before becoming Laudian Professor of Arabic in Oxford, and in Erpenius' edition of the entire New Testament.² This rendering in the Arabic of the Polyglot is further supported by the other Oriental versions of the Polyglot, Syriac, Ethiopic, and Persian, although the Latin translations are different in all four cases,³ but mean in each case 'whatever [comes] from the "suq."'⁴ Modern Arabic

¹ P. 37.

² 1590 : 1616.

³ Walton, v. 189.

⁴ 'market.'

usage, however, also may provide a parallel. On 5th February 1949, a day or two after reading Dr. Black's study of this passage and before looking up the two Arabic versions in Aleppo, while we were at breakfast the buyer for the hospital and the missionary homes at Deir ez Zor on the Euphrates came into the room and said to our hostess, 'Anything from the suq to-day, Mrs. Nelson?' It is doubtful whether in classical or in modern spoken Arabic anywhere 'min' (ἀπο) could supply the idea of a 'person,' without some such phrase as the English Versions mostly introduce, but the idea of *something* as opposed to *someone* is natural and easily understood. 'Anything from the market, except they sprinkle, they do not eat'—if for no other reason to-day in the hope of destroying the germs, but something originally worthwhile, whatever ritual was included later! There is no need for a verbal insertion of any kind in accepting Dr. Black's translation, backed as it is by Oriental scholarship and feel.

ERIC F. F. BISHOP.

Glasgow.

Let the Dead Bury Their Dead.

THIS saying in Q (Mt 8²²=Lk 9⁶⁰) is usually interpreted as referring, in the first νεκρῶν, to the 'spiritually dead,' and perhaps to the other members of the man's family so regarded. 'In our ignorance of the circumstances this sounds somewhat harsh, though it may have been the incentive that the waverer needed.'¹ McNeile goes on to suggest that 'the Greek perhaps obscures an Aram. proverb analogous to 'Let the dead past bury its dead.' No such proverb, however, has ever been discovered. The further suggestion that the infinitive θάψαι (Aram. *le'miqbar*) should be read as *lim^eqabber*, 'Leave the dead to the undertaker (lit. to him that buries their dead bodies)' is banal.

In the course of reading the Palestinian Pentateuch Targum, I have noted the word *m^ethan*, 'to delay, put off,' the pass. partic. of which, *m^ethin*, is employed as a noun to describe an individual who puts off making a decision for prudential or other reasons, e.g., Lv 24¹², Nu 9⁸, 15³⁴. The equivalent Heb. word *mathon* has a

¹ A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, in loc.

wider range: in the sense of 'slow (to decide)' it occurs in the Babylonian Talmud at *Yebam.* 63a, 'Be quick when you buy a piece of land, but *mathon* when you take a wife.' From 'slow' to 'sluggish,' 'easy-going,' 'weak' is a natural development, and in this sense the adjective describes the demoralized inhabitants of Sodom or the Amorites in the *Tosephta* (*Sabbath*, vii. [viii.]). It thus shares the meaning of the Syriac *mathin*, used to translate *ωθρός*; cf. Payne-Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, s.v. Payne-Smith quotes the phrase *talmidhe mathine, discipuli hebetes, segnes*. It is very probable that the Palestinian Aramaic *m^ethin* had the same sense and associations.

For νεκροί the Aram. may be *mithin* (אמין) or *mithyanin* (אמין). Adopting the latter, we can reconstruct an original saying with characteristic *paronomasia*: 'ithai bathrai wish^eboq *m^ethinin* qabhrin *mithyanin*.

Ἀκολουθεῖ μοι, καὶ ἄφες τοὺς νεκροὺς (?)
θάψαι τοὺς (ἐαυτῶν) νεκρούς.

MATTHEW BLACK.

Leeds.

Greek Orthodox Baptism.

In his article 'Some Important Issues for Baptismal Theology' (*THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, lxi. 108), the Rev. Reginald E. White states that 'the Greek Orthodox Church more consistently practises Infant Communion as the natural and logical correlative of Infant Baptism.'

There seems to be some misapprehension of the real situation in this statement. Infant Communion is practised in the Eastern Church because the child is regarded as 'confirmed.' In Orthodox baptism the infant is anointed with oil blessed by the Patriarch of Constantinople (or Moscow), and this ceremony is regarded as being equivalent to confirmation or the laying on of hands—the second part of the rite of Baptism; and thus the child is regarded as a fully fledged member of the Church.

I express no opinion on the merits or demerits of this practice, but merely point to its existence.

It is, however, curious that throughout Mr. White's article there is no mention of the rite of laying on of hands and its particular significance.

T. C. BOWEN.

Mountain Ash.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christ and His Church. The widespread interest in the question of the nature and function of the Church is reflected in two further issues of the Swiss series of *Cahiers Théologiques de l'Actualité Protestante* which have appeared. Of these one is by P. Bonnard and deals with *Christ edifying His Church*,¹ while the other is by P. H. Menoud and deals with *The Church and its Ministry*.² In the former of these monographs we have a short study of the concept of 'building' as applied to the Church in the New Testament, with its Old Testament background. This is both suggestive and balanced, with due insistence on the individual, but as an integral part of the corporate Church. The third chapter shows how a mere individualism is a menace. The other study is of greater importance. It considers the Church as infused and directed by the Spirit, its priestly and apostolic ministry, and the variety of service

whereby this is exercised. That the forms of service are not clearly defined and delimited in the New Testament is just what we should expect in a newly born society. What is of greater significance is the wealth and diversity of the life of the Church in its very beginnings. Moreover, it was not divided into active and passive members, but every individual was assigned some vital function in the ministry of the whole Church. Both studies deserve careful reading and have a present-day relevance in addition to their objective study of the New Testament.

The Last Supper. A new edition of Joachim Jeremias's book on *The Words of Jesus at the Last Supper*, so largely revised as to be almost a new book, comes from Göttingen.³ In it the author first discusses the question whether the Last Supper was a Passover meal or not, and defends the Synoptic tradition as against the Johannine. His acquaintance with all significant writing on this still debated problem is shown in the Bibliography with which he prefaces his discussion. For that Bibliography alone his book would be of the

¹ *Jésus-Christ édifiant son Église: le concept d'édification dans le Nouveau Testament* [1948]. 'Cahiers Théologiques,' No. 21. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel and Paris; Fr. 2.75.

² *L'Église et les ministères selon le Nouveau Testament* [1949]. 'Cahiers Théologiques,' No. 22. Delachaux et Niestlé; Fr. 2.85.

³ *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*,² [1949]. Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, Göttingen; Dm. 6.80.

first importance to every student of the problem. His own discussion of the issues will also make it indispensable to such students. It is followed by a careful consideration of the original form of the words of institution used by our Lord and of their significance, marked not only by the scholarship of the author but by the abundant references to the work of other writers in the footnotes. No problem is burked, and there is no concealment of the disagreements amongst scholars of the highest eminence on the issues involved. Whether the reader approaches this monograph with a prior agreement with the author that the Synoptic tradition is to be preferred to the Johannine—as the reviewer did—or whether he follows the influential group of scholars who take the other view, he will not fail to find this an important and a stimulating study.

The Book of Job. A third new German translation of the Book of Job, with commentary, has appeared hard on the heels of those of Hölscher and Fohrer.¹ This is by H. W. Hertzberg,² and its commentary is fuller than theirs, though like them it is addressed to a wide circle of readers. Instead of the usual delimitation of the original Book and interpretation of its message in isolation from the secondary passages, Hertzberg proposes to offer an interpretation of the whole Book, and to treat of the purpose which the compiler who was responsible for its final form cherished. The literary question is held to be secondary to the question of interpretation. Hence the Wisdom chapter (ch. 28), the Elihu speeches, and the second Divine speech are not isolated from the rest. Here the reviewer prefers to follow the more usual way and to ask what the original author of the Book intended to say, and to consider separately the purpose the interpolators may have had. Some rearrangements of the text are here undertaken, however. Thus, in the third cycle of speeches, which in the Massoretic text allows no third speech to Zophar, he offers the arrangement :

Eliphaz	22 ¹⁻³⁰ .
Job	23 ¹ -24 ^{12, 25} .
Bildad	25 ¹ 24 ¹³⁻²⁴ 25 ²⁻⁶ .
Job	26 ¹⁻⁴ 27 ^{11, 12} 26 ⁵⁻¹⁴ 27 ²⁻⁶ .
Zophar	27 ^{7-10, 13-23} .

He thus eliminates altogether Job's speech closing this cycle. In the second Divine speech also he makes a slight rearrangement, reading 40^{6-24, 31, 32} 41¹⁻³ 40²⁵⁻³⁰ 41⁴⁻²⁶. The translation of each section of the Book is followed by a general discussion of the questions it raises, and following this there are

¹ Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxi. [March, 1950], 190.

² *Das Buch Hiob (Bibelhilfe für die Gemeinde)* [1949]. J. G. Oncken Verlag, Stuttgart.

brief notes in smaller type on individual points of text or meaning. It may be noted that the author finds no reference to a resurrection in 19²⁷.

New French Commentary on the New Testament.

The first volume of a new French commentary on the New Testament, planned to be completed in fifteen volumes, and written by a team of scholars including such well-known names as those of Cullmann, Menoud, Hering and Leenhardt, has been published. It is the volume dealing with 1 Corinthians and is written by Jean Hering.³ It contains an all too brief Introduction, a new translation of the text, with a full commentary, and a good Bibliography. Important variant readings are discussed, but only where they have real philological or theological interest. The author says he has cut away the dead wood of useless references to the work of other scholars, but in the footnotes which stand below the commentary the reader will find ample references to other literature. The commentary has constant recourse to the Greek text and is judicious in its views while acquainting the reader with the variety of view on every disputed question, such as the baptism for the dead in 15²⁹. Conceived on a somewhat smaller scale than the French Catholic series of *Études Bibliques*, it offers valuable and up-to-date guidance and will have a warm welcome from a wide circle of readers. It is written less for the general reader than the Moffatt Commentaries but less for the specialist than the International Critical Commentary.

Israelite Law. An abridgment of a doctoral dissertation by Dr. Karlheinz Rabast has been published in Germany, dealing with *Apodictic Law in Deuteronomy and the Holiness Code*.⁴ The author is a disciple of Albrecht Alt, whose division of the legal forms into casuistical and apodictic law, with the recognition of the former as of non-Israelite origin and of the latter as of Israelite origin, is well known. Beginning from this Dr. Rabast examines the groups of apodictic laws found in Deuteronomy and in the Holiness Code, and then analyses the material according to the different sorts of series which it contains, studies the metrical and syntactical structure and style of the various precepts, and 'Sitz im Leben' of the laws, and the sacral character and social tendency

³ *Commentaire du Nouveau Testament*, VII.: *La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens* [1949]. Delachaux et Niestlé; Fr. 9.50 in paper, or Fr. 12.50 in cloth, with a reduction of 10 per cent. for subscribers to the complete series.

⁴ *Das apodiktische Recht im Deuteronomium und im Heiligkeitgesetz* [1949]. Heimatdienstverlag, Berlin-Hermendorf.

they display. He finds the apodictical laws are fundamentally Yahwistic, and that they are related to the Israelite covenant with Yahweh and are essentially social. In contrast to the casuistical laws, which are in prose, these laws have a rhythmical structure which distinguishes them. While this study is very compressed, it carries the work of Alt forward along one of the lines of form-criticism on which he set the study of Israelite law. The bearing of this line of study of Pentateuchal literary criticism is briefly indicated at the end. Dr. Rabast holds that apodictic law is found in its purest form in the Book of the Covenant, which he

does not study in this work. In Deuteronomy it is given a parenetic setting and purpose, while in the Holiness Code it is given a juristic rather than a theological turn. He therefore concludes that chronologically the probable order is Book of the Covenant, Deuteronomy, Holiness Code. His form-critical study does not therefore conflict with the common literary-critical conclusions, though it goes back behind the present literary collections to the sources of their material of this particular type.

H. H. ROWLEY.

Manchester University.

Entre Nous.

Dean Inge.

When Asquith, wishing to 'revive the traditions of the Deanery at St. Paul's as the most literary post in the Church—the tradition of Colet, Donne, Tillotson, Milman, Mansel, and Church,' offered the position to one who calls himself 'a shy scholar, with no social gifts,' and 'inheriting the faculty of being silent in several languages,' he took a risk that was abundantly justified. George Bernard Shaw roundly declared Dean Inge to be 'our most extraordinary writer, and in some respects our most extraordinary man.' That was, perhaps, a kindly judgment. But that Dr. Inge is possessed of a most unusual capacity is proved yet again by his *Diary of a Dean* (Hutchinson; 21s. net).

In some respects it is not a good book, consisting, as it does, too largely of a bald catalogue of innumerable preachings and lecturings and all manner of engagements chronicled, and often little more. But happily there is much more woven into that prosaic fabric. At the end of a year he is apt to look back over it, with musings that are deep and not a little moving. And when he speaks of certain things, his family for instance, his heart breaks through.

What strikes one is the enormous busyness of the man. Apart from the duties of his office, made for a time more difficult, as we are bluntly told, by a certain incompatibility in certain of his colleagues ('Cathedral chapters do not set a good example of Christian charity'), there is a constant and incredible activity. He was always preaching—to universities, in cathedrals, and in churches of all kinds up and down the land; and always lecturing, and that on an amazing diversity of themes. If a list were drawn up of his subjects, it would be extremely long and surprisingly varied. In addition, papers scrambled for articles from

his pen, and the number of his books kept mounting, while the endowed lectureships to which he was appointed were legion. At times he was uneasy over it, feeling that his devotional life was being somewhat smothered, and that he was not giving of his very best. But no one else was dissatisfied. Wherever he went crowds surged to hear him, often with hundreds left outside. This unmistakable popularity was a puzzle to himself. 'My extraordinary and incomprehensible vogue as a preacher and lecturer continues unabated.' Offers of bishoprics, professorships, headships of colleges came his way, but left him cold. He had his enemies, as was inevitable to one at the heart of the controversies of the time, and so immeasurably outspoken. 'There is G. K. Chesterton who certainly hates me, and is reported to have said that one of his reasons for becoming a papist was that he could not remain in the same church as the Dean of St. Paul's. I retaliated in my diary by hoping that the public would soon get tired of the elephantine capers of an obese mountebank. These flowers of speech happily did not find their way into print.' Perhaps it is a pity they do now! Yet of the attacks upon him he remarks, 'It does me no harm, but is not good for my spiritual life.'

Crowds of distinguished people are known, and are mentioned; but, exasperatingly, often nothing more. One gathers that no one impressed the Dean more, by his abilities and character, than Lord Haldane; perhaps no one so much.

Dean Inge is emphatic that his reputation as a pessimist is quite unjustified, is indeed a mere myth started by the reporters who were present at the first of four lectures which he gave to the Women's Diocesan Association. 'This was the beginning of the legend that I am a desperate pessimist. Whenever I spoke reporters were present, who took down every word that seemed

to support the idea. I was almost reduced to silence.' None the less, pessimist or no, the point of view for which he stood has gained the day. The old moving-staircase view of inevitable progress has grown very faded.

Characteristic sayings are scattered broadcast. 'I read a paper at the Church Congress. The audience at these meetings is rather depressing—men who look as if they were descended from a long line of maiden aunts.' 'Marie Corelli, a common, dumpy, little person with nothing interesting to say.' Mr. Rockefeller 'asked me sympathetically about St. Paul's. I told him we had all the money we want. Perhaps he seldom hears that.' 'Some of the suggestions were merely absurd, such as the retranslation of the Athanasian Creed, favoured by Bishop Gore, beginning "Whoever wishes to be spiritually healthy." The author of the Creed would have waxed really profane if he had heard that.' 'In England, and I think in other countries too, almost all the serious thinking on theology is done by laymen.' He is at times very severe on others. His bishop is sadly mauled. But—an excellent sign of a man—he can laugh at himself. 'To Windsor, to preach before the King and Queen. I was met by a royal carriage drawn by two white horses, and by an enormous omnibus to carry my handbag.' 'Foakes Jackson has written to him in great indignation at reviews of his books by Barnes and myself. Barnes, he said, may be forgiven on the ground of invincible ignorance, but Inge will certainly be damned.' 'The Americans say that perhaps Bernard Shaw or Rudyard Kipling would have as great a reception' (as Inge himself), 'but nobody else. Very gratifying, but why don't they buy my books? They don't.'

To one who wishes well to the Church of England this is rather a disquieting view of it, taken as it is from the inside. The dissensions in it seem unhappily acute, and the policy of the Archbishops a rather scared holding of things together. Gore, working upon this, kept threatening secession. One hears of further talks of union with other denominations. It would seem that, in the meantime, their own ranks are sadly out of step. This is a pity; and not good for any one.

A. J. GOSSIP.

Disinterestedness.

'1931 January 15.—I gave an address at Birmingham on Lippmann's *Preface to Morals*, which seems to me a valuable and interesting book. Some Americans, like Lippmann, Santayana, and Thornton Wilder, have an excellent English style; others give us on every other page words which

we have never heard before and do not wish to hear again. The main argument of Lippmann's book is that "disinterestedness" is the vital part of higher religion. Aldous Huxley has since said the same, calling it, less happily, non-attachment. When I was ordained deacon by the saintly Bishop King of Lincoln (I was ordained on my King's Fellowship, for by a curious anomaly the Bishop of Lincoln and not the Bishop of Ely is our diocesan at King's) the only thing that the Bishop said to me was "Be disinterested; that is what really matters." Perhaps no wiser counsel could be given to a young man who might be suspected of being ambitious. I have always remembered it; though I have taken occasion to say, "Don't fancy yourself disinterested when you are only uninterested, and don't fancy yourself attracted by God when you are only repelled by man."¹

2 Kings v. 18.

'1923 June 20.—. . . But what in the world have I done that I should be considered more distinguished than Welldon, Ryle, Perry, Harmer, Goodhart, Burrows, Macnaghten, and Monty James? These inflated reputations have to be paid for with heavy interest. When I am dead shall I be branded as a successful humbug, an unbelieving cleric, a disagreeable fellow with no manners, and heaven knows what else? We ought to be able to say with St. Paul, "With me it is a very small thing to be judged of you or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self, but He that judgeth me is the Lord." That final judgment is not likely to be very favourable in my case. I have done many things that I am heartily ashamed of, and very few that I can remember with satisfaction. But I believe I have been honest, and have not bowed myself in the house of Rimmon more than I could possibly help.'²

Booker T. Washington.

There are some men about whom no author could help writing an interesting book and Booker T. Washington was such a man. But in *Booker T. Washington* (S.C.M.; 18s. net) the Rev. Basil Mathews has succeeded in writing not only an interesting but an authoritative book on one who ranks with the very few men who were really great.

Booker T. Washington was born a slave. He knew neither the date of his birth nor his father's name. There was a time when Booker T. Washington had, as it were, a price ticket on him, for in

¹ W. R. Inge, *Diary of a Dean*. St. Paul's 1911-34, 155.

² *Ib.*, 86.

the records of Franklin County there is a list of ten slaves of James Burroughs with their assessed value. Booker was priced at 400 dollars, his elder brother, John, at 550 dollars, his little sister, Amanda, at 200 dollars, while Jane, their mother, was valued at 250 dollars.

The coming of freedom to the slaves brought many more problems than it solved; and to Washington was given the task of seeking and finding a solution to many of these problems. From his earliest days he had a passion for education. He heard of the Hampton Institute where negroes might be educated. He set out to go to it and in the end got there, penniless and in rags and tatters. The lady who was head teacher had grave doubts about admitting this scarecrow of a figure; but he waited on.

'Looking up and seeing him still there, the head teacher ejaculated, "The adjoining recitation room needs sweeping. Take that broom and sweep it."

'Booker leaped at the chance. All that severe discipline that Mrs. Ruffner (in whose employ he had been) had taught him came to his aid. He swept the room three times, including the cupboards. He moved every piece of furniture. He got hold of a duster and went four times over every inch of wood in the room. Then he reported. The head teacher, with her Yankee zest for chasing dirt, examined every corner. Finally she took her handkerchief from her pocket and rubbed it on the table and benches. It remained spotless.

'He was in the seventh heaven when she turned to him after this strange examination and said, "'I guess you will do to enter this institution.'"

Having absorbed all that Hampton Institute could give him Washington taught here and there, but his great work was done at Tuskegee with which his name will always be connected. He had to start from absolutely nothing. He had even to learn to make the bricks from which his buildings were constructed. All kinds of people gave gifts. 'No gift touched Booker quite so deeply as that of an old, illiterate ex-slave woman, in rags, but cleanly, who hobbled into the schoolroom one day, leaning on a cane and said, "I ain't got no money, but I want you to take these six eggs . . . and I wants you to put these six eggs into de eddication o' dese boys an' gals.'"

Tuskegee grew until it numbered its students by the thousands, and behind it all was Booker Washington. One of his right-hand men said of him, 'We often reason that we can't do a thing because we haven't done it. He himself did, and called on us to do what had been done. He paid no attention to what had not been done elsewhere.' It was always the future in which he was interested. Once he went on a tour to Europe. 'I registered a firm resolution,' he said, 'that if I could prevent

it I would not enter a single palace, museum, gallery or cathedral. . . . I have never been greatly interested in the past, for the past is something that you cannot change. I like the new, the unfinished and the problematic.' He was a master of detail. All his colleagues got notes from him about the smallest matter. Even his wife was not exempt. She received one in the following terms: 'The yard of the Practice Cottage does not present a model appearance by any means. So far as I can see there is not the sign of a flower or anything like a flower or shrub in the yard.' Basil Mathews comments: 'One may wonder whether or not this is the note to which an answer came, found undated in the file and signed by Mrs. Washington, which simply reads, "Umph! Umph!! Umph!!!"'

Booker Washington had a gift for memorable sayings. 'No man shall drag me down by making me hate him.' 'No race can prosper till it learns that there is as much dignity in tilling a field as in writing a poem.' 'There are two ways of exerting one's strength—one is pushing down, the other is pulling up.' 'The world looks more hopeful and more filled with God's providence when you are at the bottom looking up than when you are at the top looking down.' Booker Washington was a very great man. As Basil Mathews says of him: 'The aim and influence of the Superman is to make other men—even other great men—small. The aim and influence of Booker Washington made small men great.'

In writing this book Basil Mathews has had access to many original records, letters and documents, besides having had many conversations with those who knew Booker Washington. He has produced a book of absorbing interest, a book which the reader will find it hard to put down once he has taken it up. The pity is that it is published at a price at which many people will not be able to buy it.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

The Expository Times, volume xlviii.

A subscriber who lent volume 48 of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES and to whom it was not returned is anxious to have another copy. If any reader has this volume for disposal perhaps he would kindly write to the Editorial Office. If a bound volume is not available the separate numbers would be acceptable. They are October 1936 to September 1937 inclusive.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.